

PRESBYTERY OF NEW YORK.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

AGAINST

THE REV. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.

ARGUMENT OF
REV. GEORGE W. F. BIRCH, D.D.,

A Member of the Prosecuting Committee.

PRESBYTERY OF NEW YORK.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

AGAINST

THE REV. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.

ARGUMENT OF

REV. GEORGE W. F. BIRCH, D.D.,

A Member of the Prosecuting Committee.

PRESS OF
DOUGLAS TAYLOR
8 WARREN ST.
N. Y.

INTRODUCTION.

MR. MODERATOR, FATHERS AND BRETHREN OF THIS VENERABLE COURT OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, THE PRESBYTERY OF NEW YORK: The opening plea of this case demands a brief outline of its history. On Tuesday evening, January 20th, 1891, the Rev. Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., was inaugurated as the incumbent of the Edward Robinson Chair of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of New York City. On that occasion he made and subscribed the following declaration: "I believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and I do now, in the presence of God and the Directors of this Seminary, solemnly and sincerely receive and adopt the Westminster Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures. I do also in like manner approve of the Presbyterian form of government; and I do solemnly promise that I will not teach or inculcate anything which shall appear to me to be subversive of the said system of doctrines or of the said Form of Government as long as I shall continue to be a professor in the Seminary."*

The Inaugural Address which followed the utterance and subscription of the pledge just recited, led the Presbytery of New York, at its meeting on April 13th, 1891, to adopt the following paper:

"*Whereas*, The Address of the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D. D., a member of this Presbytery, delivered on Tuesday evening, January 20th, 1891, on the occasion of his inauguration as the 'Incumbent of the Edward Robinson Chair of Biblical Theology,' in the Union Theological Seminary (which Address has since been published by said Seminary), has been very generally criticised as containing statements which are seemingly contrary to the teachings and spirit of our Confession of Faith; and

* Inaugural Address, Third Edition, page 10.

Whereas, This Address has also been actually made the occasion of complaint to the General Assembly by at least four Presbyteries; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That a Committee consisting of seven persons be appointed, to which the said Address shall be referred for consideration, with instructions to report at the meeting in May, what action, if any, be appropriate in relation thereto.”

Whereupon the following Committee was appointed, viz.: Rev. Messrs. George W. F. Birch, Henry Vandyke, Joseph J. Lampe, Jesse F. Forbes and J. H. McIlvaine, with Elders John J. Stevenson and Walter Edwards.*

The Committee regretted to report the resignation of Dr. Vandyke, who has requested me to state that he declined to serve, on the ground of “more important business.”

The report of this Committee adopted by the Presbytery at its meeting on May 12th, 1891, recommended the judicial investigation of the case. Hence, in accordance with *Section 11* of the Book of Discipline, the Prosecuting Committee, from May 17th, 1891, to the present time, has discharged its task in pursuance of a minute furnished by the Stated Clerk which states that its work is “to arrange and prepare the necessary proceedings appropriate to the case of Dr. Briggs.” The authority and the rights of this Committee as an original party have been established by the Court of Final Appeal, the General Assembly of 1892, in the very decree under which this Court is in present session. After due consideration the Prosecuting Committee, under a full sense of its responsibility to God, with a view to the welfare of the Church and controlled by a desire to deal justly and fairly by Dr. Briggs, has concluded to table the charges and specifications which have been read in your hearing.

The Court will observe, Mr. Moderator, that the Committee has confined the charges and specifications to the Inaugural Address. In a second edition published over his own name, Dr. Briggs reaffirms every statement of the Inaugural in the following emphatic manner: “I have seen nothing in the hostile criticism to lead me to make any change whatever either in

* Record, page 24.

the matter or the form of the address."* The Court will remember that the re-affirmation was made subsequent to Dr. Briggs' answers to the categorical questions propounded by the directors of the Union Theological Seminary.

A word or two with respect to those categorical questions, each of which, in my opinion, is answered in the very asking of the question. These questions, with Dr. Briggs' "Yes" and "No" appended, have been deemed by several a sufficient and satisfactory explanation of the declarations of the Inaugural. It will be remembered, however, that the substitute presented by Dr. George Alexander, October 5th, 1891† (which was lost and which was based on these categorical questions), was careful to note that the Presbytery did not choose to pronounce upon the sufficiency of those declarations to cover all the points concerning which Dr. Briggs was called in question. Now, I regard this substitute of Dr. George Alexander as an attempt on the part of those who supported it to spring the categorical catechism of the Union Seminary Board of Directors upon the Presbytery as a finality. It was simply an interference in judicial proceedings which the Presbytery had begun by a body of men who are no Presbytery at all nor a Church Court of any degree. Who authorized the Board of Directors to ask those questions? Who gives authority or pertinence to either questions or answers? I think that the only thing the Presbytery ought to have done was to have ruled those questions and answers out of Court. Let us recall the precise position of affairs. There were repeated and recent publications (especially the Inaugural Address), of views which are regarded by many as variously and deeply unsound, as compromising our whole system of theology, with the aggravation of coming from a prominent professor in a Theological Seminary, with intimations that these views are taught and are to be taught. Privately a party questions this professor. Are you unsound? Did you say anything unsound? And he answers, "No." Clearly, Mr. Moderator, this is a bit of by-play with which this Court has nothing to do. It is not *ad rem*. The duty of our Commit-

* Inaugural, Third Edition, Preface.

† Record, pages (64-65).

tee was to gather out of the Inaugural Address definite statements of error and prove that these were published by Professor Briggs. Then he should either recant with equal publicity or be censured at the discretion of the Presbytery.

It may prevent confusion to note at this point the fact that the only fountain of authority in this case is set forth in the title-page of our Confession of Faith, which reads as follows: "The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, containing the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Directory for the Worship of God, together with the Plan of Government and Discipline, as ratified and adopted by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia in the year of our Lord 1788; and as amended in the years 1805-1888.

The authority for this title-page is found in the following extract from the minutes of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, dated May 29th, 1788: "And the Synod order that the said Directory and Catechisms be printed and bound up in the same volume with the Confession of Faith and the Form of Government and Discipline, and that the whole be considered as the standard of our doctrine, government, discipline, and worship, agreeably to the resolutions of the Synod at their present session." *

The framers of this Constitution endeavored to adapt the doctrine, government, and discipline of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland to American institutions. Among the individuals who were active in the work were Drs. Witherspoon, Rodgers, Woodhull, McWhorter, Samuel Stanhope Smith, George Duffield and Ashbel Green. It is not difficult to reach a consensus of interpretation of the Constitution on the part of the members of the adopting Synod through their writings. The Assembly's Digest is our record of authoritative precedent. This fact is not to be set aside by the interpretations which members of the Westminster Assembly of Divines may have put upon the Westminster Confession—by instances of ecclesiastical procedure in the Church of Scotland. In the adjudication of this case the recognized, the proper authorities are neither Anthony Burgess, nor Edward Reynolds, nor John Arrowsmith, nor Robert Baylie,

* Records of Presbyterian Church, page 547.

nor Samuel Rutherford, nor any other one of the makers of the Westminster Confession. The adopting act of the Synod of 1729, in the present juncture, is history and not law. The rule of law here is not the action of the Scottish Presbyteries in the cases which gave birth to the Free Church of Scotland; or in the trial of Robertson Smith. This Church Court must give heed to the framers of our Constitution, even if the statement be true (which personally I do not grant), which I read in that well-known book called "Whither," that they "were not noted for their wisdom and ability. They were pious, excellent, practical men, but there was not one really eminent divine among them. There was not one who could rank as a first-rate authority in Biblical, historical, dogmatic or even practical theology. They entirely set aside more than half of the work of the Westminster divines. There is no reason to doubt that they would have made a new Confession of Faith, if they had deemed it wise to do so."* And so they just arranged the Confession and the Form of Government as they wished to. Notwithstanding the departure from what I believe to be fact, with which this quotation abounds—notwithstanding the misrepresentation of such men as Drs. Witherspoon, Rodgers and Green—American Presbyterianism knows no fundamental law but that made by the Fathers in 1788, and applied and amended by their successors. To decide this case by any other would be as unreasonable as for our Supreme Court at Washington to set aside, for the sake of British precedent, the American Constitution, or for a court in New York City to decide a case by the Code Napoleon.

Let this venerable court understand that the gravamen of the charges and specifications reported by the Prosecuting Committee lies in the fact affirmed by the majority report of the Committee of Inquiry whose recommendation was adopted by the Presbytery, April 13th, 1891. Announcing the result of a comparison of the Inaugural Address with the Westminster Confession, the Committee of Inquiry declared that "after making due allowance for reasonable latitude of interpretation," the "Address does conflict with the Confession." Indeed the reason of the appointment of this Prosecuting Committee, was

* Briggs' "Whither," pages 32-33.

the conviction of the Presbytery that the "Inaugural Address," as to word, spirit and temper was a transgression of all reasonable latitude of interpretation so unique as to demand judicial investigation.*

It is one thing for a man to empty a minute blood-vessel, and another to sever the principal artery or to cut the jugular vein; one thing to have a bullet imbedded in the calf of the leg and another to have it pierce the heart or the brain. It is one thing in a building to cut a door here and to close up a window there, and another to go down to the cellar and remove the main supports of the upper stories. Every system, whether material, mental or moral, manifests the distinction between the incidental and the vital. To lose, to remove or to forsake the former may occasion more or less inconvenience; it may be injury. To lose, to remove or to forsake the latter means in every case destruction.

We can conceive of no condition of the human system that will permit the severance of the principal artery or jugular vein—that will permit our neighbor to shoot us through the heart or brain. Neither can we conceive of any reasonable latitude of interpretation that will excuse Dr. Briggs' teaching as set forth in the Charges and Specifications. The proofs have been and will be given that these teachings are a life stab—a life stroke at the system of Bible Truth set forth in the Westminster Standards. These teachings strike away the foundation support on which the Westminster symbols stand in their work for the Church as the pillar and ground of the truth. Let me not be understood as saying that the Presbyterian Church does not bear with a great many departures from the Westminster Standards; with a great many vagaries of her theological instructors, as there are those who care neither what they say nor what they affirm. "A man," one tells us, "has been known to get along with his arms and legs gone; without eyes; with a part of his skull shot away; but it was an existence hardly worthy of the name of life." But when the death-dealing ball is aimed at his heart, the question is not between life and death; it is life or death.

* Record, Page 32.

No member of this Court will doubt that the Inaugural Address deals with things vitally essential to not only the adoption but the very existence of the Standards of the Presbyterian Church. The opinion that its dealing with them is a contradiction of the Holy Scripture, which is the basis of those Standards, and consequently a contradiction of the Standards themselves, I am here to maintain with all my heart, soul, strength and mind.

The attention of the Court is now invited to Charges I. and II., which differ only in their subject and which require—although distinct—for the most part a similar line of argument.

SOURCE OF AUTHORITY.

CHARGE I.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a Minister of the said Presbyterian Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that the Reason is a fountain of divine authority to such an extent that it may and does savingly enlighten men, even such men as reject the Scriptures as the authoritative proclamation of the will of God and reject also the way of salvation through the mediation and sacrifice of the Son of God as revealed therein; all of which is contrary to the essential doctrine of the Holy Scripture, and of the Standards of the said Church, that the Holy Scripture is most necessary, and the rule of faith and practice.

Charge II. is as follows:

“The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a Minister of the said Presbyterian Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that the Church is a fountain of divine authority which, apart from the Holy Scripture, may and does savingly enlighten men; which is contrary to the essential doctrine of the Holy Scripture and of the Standards of the said Church, that the Holy Scripture is most necessary and the rule of faith and practice.”

Unless requested I will omit the specifications under this charge, as they have been printed.

If these charges be true, Dr. Briggs has pulled out of its place the golden thread which God has woven into the Holy Scripture and which the framers of our Constitution have woven into the Standards of the Presbyterian Church. If these charges be true, I ask, where stands the whole world of Evangelical Christendom, to say nothing of our Presbyterianism? What becomes of Chillingworth's famous boast: "The Bible—the Bible is the only religion of Protestants"? Professor Schaff, of the Union Theological Seminary, in the preface to the American Edition of Lange's Commentary on the New Testament, writes: "The Bible is first and last a book of religion. It presents the only true universal and absolute religion of God;"* and in the "Creeds of Christendom" he writes thus concerning the Westminster Confession's Statement of the "Divine inspiration" and "authority" of the Bible "and its sufficiency as an infallible rule of faith and practice": "No other Protestant symbol has such a clear, judicious, precise and exhaustive statement of this fundamental article of Protestantism."† But further, Dr. Henry B. Smith, another Professor of Union Theological Seminary, says in his sermon on "The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures" (p. 3), "We are to adduce the evidence that they (the original canonical Scriptures) are the word of God, and as such an infallible and final authority for faith and life." But lastly, Rev. Dr. Murkland, of Baltimore, has told us, "One of the most distinguished of the Roman Catholic prelates of this country said to a friend of mine not long ago, 'There is one Church that we fear above all others, and that is the Presbyterian Church, because we always know where to find it, and it meets us at every point with an intelligent answer for its faith and the Bible for its basis.' If I were to call," continues Dr. Murkland, "for testimony from another direction, I would call upon the rampant infidelity of this age which dares to say (and I glory in saying it) that the Church which it hates above all others is the Presbyterian Church. Why is this? It is because

* Lange on Matthew, page 5 (Preface).

† Schaff's Creeds of Christendom, Vol I., page 767.

we stand on the historic confessions." The members of this Court, Mr. Moderator, do not need to be told that the key-note of this confessional chorus is the declaration which every Presbyterian minister affirms, as his ordination depends upon the proper answer to the question, "Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?"

Specification I. brings to view the word which is a very prominent one throughout this controversy. That term is the word "fountain." A fountain, * * according to Webster, is a source from which anything is supplied continuously; origin; first cause. And because a source it confers "authority." The Presbyteries are the fountain of all our ecclesiastical authority. Synods and Assemblies owe all their authority to the Presbyteries. Our civil authority finds its fountain "in the people." To call the Church and Reason fountains of divine authority in matters of religious faith and worship is to affirm their authority therein. If their authority be divine, and if by either of them a man can find out God unto salvation apart from the Scriptures, as Dr. Briggs teaches; if by the Church and Reason a man can attain to the knowledge of God as a pardoning God, regenerating, justifying, sanctifying and saving the soul, and bringing it through Divine Grace to glory and eternal life, the Holy Scripture, instead of being "most necessary," is only a superfluity. Therefore it is useless to say, as Dr. Briggs did in the response to the charges and specifications preferred by the Prosecuting Committee:

"The Reason is a 'great fountain of divine authority,' and yet not an 'infallible rule of faith and practice.' The Church is a 'great fountain of divine authority,' and yet not an 'infallible rule of faith and practice.' 'The Bible is a great fountain of divine authority,' and it is also 'the only infallible rule of faith and practice.' Here are two different statements of truths that may be embraced under a more general truth, but to affirm the one, as to Bible, Church, and Reason, that 'they are great fountains of divine authority,' is not to deny that the Bible is the only one of which the other can be affirmed, namely, that

‘ the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice.’ ”
(Response, p. 20.)

For if these words be true, the “ Church and Reason ” are not fallible in such a case, for if they confer on any man the sure and certain knowledge of God unto salvation, they confer an infallible knowledge, and the Scriptures can do no more. Hence, there is no escape from the conclusion that the Inaugural Address co-ordinates the Church and Reason with the Bible. It is simply an evasion and a contradiction to say that the Church and Reason are “ fallible,” while insisting that they infallibly lead a soul to eternal life apart from the Scriptures.

The whole argument of the “ Inaugural Address ” is made in the interest of this very view. Dr. Briggs assailed the inerrancy and infallibility of the Scriptures, and assailing these he introduced “ the Church and Reason ” as two additional fountains of Divine Authority needed to give us that “ certitude ” which the errant and fallible Scriptures could not give by themselves because errant and fallible. It avails nothing to plead in the “ Response ” that of the three fountains of Divine Authority two are “ fallible ” and one only “ infallible,” viz. : the Scriptures. Necessity is the mother of invention, and the quotation from the Response seems to be an after thought. The original words and argument cannot be thus explained away. For either the Church and the Reason do not give us a sure and certain knowledge of God unto salvation, in which case they are indeed “ fallible ” and of no authority in finding eternal life, or they do give us the sure and certain knowledge of God unto salvation, in which case they are “ infallible ” as the Scriptures themselves. Dr. Briggs asserts that they do give men this sure and certain knowledge, and adduces Cardinal Newman and Dr. James Martineau as representative Christians, who thus found out God, Heaven and Eternal Life apart from the Scriptures. It is simply unreasonable to say in such a case that the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice. They are not. The denial of “ infallibility ” to the “ Divine Authority ” of the Church and Reason, while yet they give to men a sure and certain knowledge of God unto salvation, is a glaring contradiction, and is no plea in abatement of the charges made in this case.

I now invite the attention of the Court to the Scripture cited which the statements set forth in the specifications contradict.

“To the law and the testimony,” Isaiah viii. 20, if they (whether it be Church or Reason) “speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them.” It is due to Dr. Briggs to quote the words of the Response by which he so summarily dismisses this citation.

“(a) Many texts are torn from their context. The first passage cited is from Isa. viii. 20. The passage is incorrectly translated in the version used, for the meaning ‘there is no light in them’ is not justified. The revised version renders ‘surely there is no morning for them,’ they have no hope of a dawn of brighter things. The proper rendering is:

‘When they say unto you, Seek unto the necromancers and unto wizards; Ye chirpers and mutterers, should not a people seek unto their God? On behalf of the living will they seek, unto the dead for instruction and for testimony? If they say not so, who have no dawn,’ etc.

This passage has no reference whatever to the Holy Scriptures, or any part of them; but it is a rebuke of the people of Judah for seeking necromancers and wizards, rather than the living God.” (Response, pp. 30-31.)

Lange’s Commentary, prepared under the superintendence of Professor Schaff, of the Union Theological Seminary, is diametrically opposed to this statement of Dr. Briggs. In Lange’s Isaiah, p. 138, we read, “Now Isaiah refers his disciples to the divine source of light and comfort which alone can keep them upright in the impending evil days. Whoever does not find these his support will undoubtedly be destroyed. Who shall say, to the law and the testimony”? All that have no dawn. They are such as nowhere see in any outward relations a ray of light that announces the day of salvation. Where such see no inward comfort and support by means of God’s word, they wander oppressed and hungry, &c.” Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander interprets as follows: “Instead of resorting to these unprofitable and forbidden sources, the disciples of Jehovah are instructed to resort to the law and to the testimony (*i. e.*, to divine revelation considered as a system of belief and as a rule of duty), if they speak

(*i. e.*, if any speak) not according to this word (another name for the revealed will of God), it is he to whom there is no dawn; or morning (*i. e.*, no relief from the dark night of calamity). The first clause is elliptical. None can speak inconsistently with God's word—or none can refuse to utter this word (*viz.*, to the law and to the testimony) but one whom God has abandoned." *

Thus we see that the citation from Isaiah is, if you please, a defense of itself on the part of Holy Scripture, and it brings the Church and Reason as presented in the Inaugural down to the plane of the necromancers and wizards of Isaiah's time. It proves that there is no morning to those who abide in Newman's mediæval darkness or in Martineau's spiritual blindness.

Matthew 10: (32-33). "32 Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. 33 But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."

Can any one, in view of the Christ of the Bible, think of James Martineau's denial of the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection of the Body, the personality of the Holy Ghost—of his rejection of the miracles of the Bible—of his denial of the truth of Gospel narratives and the most of the Theology of the Epistles, and call his attitude a confession of Jesus Christ? The "Every one," therefore, of the Greek (rendered in the authorized version whosoever) strikes out the exception which the Inaugural Address makes in favor of James Martineau. The Master thus hears witness to the truth of Charge I.

It is in view of time and eternity, earth, heaven and hell, human probation and human destiny, that Jesus Christ shows that nothing can take the place of the Bible as the means of salvation as He utters the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Abraham from the Church in heaven proclaims to the rich man in hell, the all-sufficiency of the Holy Scripture for the knowledge on the part of his brethren of what was involved in human

* Alexander on Isaiah (abridgment), Vol. I., page 128.

immortality in view of the future sufferings of the lost and of the future joys of the saved, as appears from Luke 16: 29-31.

“29 Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. 30 And he said, Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. 31 And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets; neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.”

The next citation is that familiar verse with which our Lord meets the caviling Jews.

“John v. 39 Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me.” The only difference between the Jews and our Lord with respect to the Scriptures as the Fountain of Divine Authority lies in His appeal to them as the Divine Authority with respect to Himself, and in their rejection of the voice of an authority which they themselves acknowledged. Indeed the Book to whose sceptre they bowed was claimed by Him as His witness.

The announcement of Christ as the way to the Father, as the Truth with regard to the way, and as the Life which is the animating motive power of the way of Christ as the only way to the Father, is the burden of the next citation.

“John xiv. 6. Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.”

But the Inaugural teaches that Martineau does come to the Father; finds God and divine certainty in another way than by Christ, which recalls Tholuck's remark quoted in Lange on John, edited, revised and enlarged by Professor Schaff, “And so when a man is saved the Lord Christ must have a hand in the work,” says Luther, rightly citing these words against Zwingli, who makes a Theseus, a Socrates (the Inaugural Address makes Martineau) to be saved even without Christ. But let us listen to the beloved Disciple in 1 John v. 10. “He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son;” teaching that to reject the Bible (the record, the testimony which God hath given hath testified, concerning his Son, or to substitute anything for it or even to

put anything alongside of it, is to make God (who according to the Westminster Confession is truth) a liar. The man who does this, to quote Luther again, has told and even tells God to the face, "Thou liest." Martineau declares that he does not believe the record that God gave of his Son, and yet, according to Specification II., the Inaugural Address teaches that he found God and rested on divine authority. It was to a company who magnified the Church—the devotees of ritualism—that the Apostle Paul spoke when he said (Galatians 1:9), "as we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." It needs no argument, exposition or illustration of mine to add to the power and solemnity of the fact that in this text the finger of God touches the Inaugural's doctrine (set forth in Specifications 1, 2) of the three-fold source of Divine Authority, and writes upon it Anathema. But read 2 Tim. iii. 15 to 17.—15 And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 16 All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 17 That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. And do we not find that a minister of the Church, one of Paul's theological students, upon whom the great apostle pressed the importance of thorough scholarship, is taught that the wisdom whose result is salvation, that the Church's system of doctrine, her standard of reproof, her law of correction, her text book of instruction, her manual of practical religion, is the Bible and the Bible alone.

The last Scriptural citation under Charge I. is:

2 Pet. i. 19. We have also a more sure word of prophecy whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the daystar arise in your hearts.

2 Pet. i. 20, 21.—20 Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation, 21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

Peter introduces this statement by calling attention to the

Divine revelation to himself of the divinity, the glory, the office work of the Lord Jesus Christ as his ear heard the voice and his eye witnessed the glory of the transfiguration. As he speaks in the name of God from the standpoint of the Transfiguration, he is the representative of the Church. As he writes, "No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation," he contemplates the standpoint of Reason, which reminds one of the remark of Oliver Wendell Holmes that "as iron is almost never found in the earth pure, but usually in some combination, as the sulphuret of iron, the oxide of iron, etc., so truth is seldom found pure in human minds, but rather as the Jonesate of truth; and the Brownsite of truth."

The Apostle turns, however, from his oral testimony as a representative of the Church, and from the Reason as it claims to sit in judgment on the Bible, to the Bible itself as the fountain of divine authority, in the citation already given.*

Peter had not died before he discerned the baleful influence of false teachers. Hence, he was careful to devise a legacy to the Church in this written testimony of the fundamental truths of the gospel opposing to error the sure prophetic word of the Old Testament, and the Apostolical eye and ear witness of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. Had he not heard Jesus Christ say, "I am the Light of the World; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness"? Our Lord thus told us to take heed to the light that shineth in a dark place, as the Bible Gospel is the means by which he brings life and immortality to light. When Peter's beloved brother Paul wrote to the Philippians, "Ye shine as lights in the world," he spoke of those who take heed unto the light that shineth in a dark place by holding forth the word of life. No mariner ever ought to watch the lighthouse more earnestly and faithfully than we life-voyagers, whether sinners environed by the darkness of evil, or Christians with sails set for heaven in the shadow of earth's dark glass, should take heed unto this written inspired Bible as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.

In closing this exposition of Scripture, I propose to examine

* 2 Pet. i. 19-21.

four Bible witnesses who have been summoned to the stand to show the relations of the Bible, the Church and Reason. They are the Ethiopian Eunuch, Cornelius, the Bereans and Apollos.

(a.) The Ethiopian Eunuch, Acts viii. 26-40. According to Prof. Schaff this man was a heathen convert to Judaism. The story of his conversion carries us through from the darkness of human reason to Jesus Christ as the light of the soul, as starting at heathenism under the guidance of Dr. Lyman Abbott, we come to worship, "from worship to the study of the Word, from study to personal inquiry, from inquiry to acceptance." As Acts 8 (32-35) gives the place of the Scripture which he read, we have the use of the Bible as the Fountain of Divine Authority. As the text which was the subject of the Eunuch's inquiry and Philip's preaching is a Bible revelation of the atonement; it is evident that Philip affirmed what James Martineau denies. The Eunuch listened as, with the key of the Gospel narrative, Philip unlocked the Old Testament prophecy, and the seeking soul, enlightened, convinced and exultant, found God and Divine certainty in the Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection of the Bible Jesus Christ the Son of God. Evidently the Bible did for the Eunuch what Church and Reason could not do.

(b.) Cornelius. This Roman, although a devout, praying, almsgiving heathen whose ear was open to every voice of reason with respect to the questions, "What am I? Whose am I? Where am I going?" had never been able to formulate the Inaugural's dream concerning Martineau. He never felt that God was enthroned in his own soul. A voice from heaven told him that Reason could never do Peter's work, which was to tell him what he ought to do. Peter told him by simply expounding the Bible, and he found out that he ought to believe in Jesus Christ, which involved his acceptance of the Incarnation, Bible Miracle, Gospel Narrative, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Final Judgment, the cleansing, redeeming, sufficient Atonement.

Acts x. (34-43) 34 Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: 35 But in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. 36 The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he is the

Lord of all :) 37 That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism, which John preached: 38 How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him. 39 And we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree: 40 Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly: 41 Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. 42 And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. 43 To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.

And when Luke records Peter's story of the centurion's conversion it is as if inspiration had drawn the line of erasure through the Inaugural's statements with reference to Martineau. When Peter opened his discourse with the words "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons," he taught that this Inaugural had no right to teach that God would do for James Martineau that which he did not do for Cornelius, nor for the Ethiopian Eunuch. If to fear God and work righteousness would have saved Cornelius, what did God mean when he told him to send for Peter? The capability of being saved (the thing that Peter means) through Christ is one thing. The fitness to be saved without Christ is another thing. The differentiation here is not national; it is individual. The Bible does not exclude James Martineau from the Evangelical Church because he is an Englishman. It excludes him because he denies the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel of the Son of God. It excludes him because he depreciates the means of grace essential to every one of us. This is the opinion of the average Christian world, and hence it does not lift Martineau to the plane of Spurgeon. If Martineau be a representative Christian, then the praying and alms of Cornelius, his message to Peter, the

preaching of the Apostle, and the joy of the Roman—it was all a delusion.*

(c.) The Bereans, Acts xvii. 10-12. If ever inquiring men confronted the Inaugural's three fountains of authority, those persons were the members of the Berean congregation of Paul and Silas. There was the Bible that they searched daily. There was the Church speaking in the Jewish dispensation through the synagogue and speaking in the Christian dispensation through Paul and Silas. There was Reason pointing to Olympus, the shrine of the Father of gods and men, and speaking through the philosophies of the day. In a time of reason and philosophers and critics, these Bereans reasoned out of the Scriptures. And Paul must have had them in his mind when he wrote to the Thessalonians.

1 Thess. ii. 13. For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the Word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the Word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.

And so Luke completes the syllogism with the sentence, "Therefore many of them (the Jewish churchmen) believed: also of honorable women which were Greeks and of men not a few (Gentiles who, although they may have been proselytes, were at some period of their lives disciples of reason).

(d.) Apollos, Acts xviii. 24-28. An Alexandrian Jew, he must have acquired that familiarity with the processes of reason incident to birth and growth in a city famed for its achievements in literature, philosophy and criticism, and for one of the greatest libraries of the world. An Alexandrian Jew, he must have caught the spirit of the circle that sent forth the Septuagint translation of the Scriptures. The record warrants the opinion that he was an expert in Biblical theology. The original gives us to understand that he was a careful, exact, accurate, eloquent and learned instructor in the things of the Lord. His lack did not arise from his position in the Church, but from his want of the whole Bible, for he knew only the baptism of John. The Scripture history of John the Baptist proves, however, that this

* Lange on Acts, pages 204-205.

Biblical Theologian never preached the Inaugural's doctrines of predicted prophecy and that the process of redemption from sin was not completed in this life. If Apollos had been a member of this court, I have reason to believe that he would have answered the call to a vote on Dr. George Alexander's resolution to strike out Charges IV. and VII. with a positive, superlative John the Baptist No.

To which of the three, Bible, Church or Reason, did this philosopher, critic, theologian, preacher point as the fountain of divine authority? Certainly not to the Church, if we are to believe John the Baptist's estimate of the Church. Certainly not to the Reason, because Reason failed him until it laid hold of the postulates of the Bible under the teaching of Aquila and Priscilla. The Bible stands out as the one only fountain of Divine Authority as Apollos helped believers. "For he mightily convinced the Jews or (Revised Version) powerfully confuted—or (Dr. Edward Robinson) 'confuted utterly' or (Alford) 'argued down,' as we say, 'proved it in their teeth,' and that publicly shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ."

The statements of the Standards, as cited, lead directly to the conclusion that the place which the Inaugural assigns to Reason is not the Confession's subordination of Reason to the Bible. The Confession teaches that it is the office of the Bible to help the Reason to take hold of facts which the Reason of itself cannot fathom, and by the Reason I mean the metaphysical categories, the conscience and the religious feeling. The Bible describes several of the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel (among them Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection of the body) (which Martineau denies) as mysteries. It is the plan of salvation to which Paul refers when he writes to Timothy. I. Timothy, 3:16: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." So that the mystery of godliness, is Christ, who is God Incarnate. A Bible mystery is properly defined as "a revealed secret." The resurrection, the mutual relation of Christ and His Church, the Plan of Salvation, the Incarnation, although mysteries, are essential facts

which find their reason in the needs of the human race. What does the Bible say about those needs? The Epistles teach that we are without God, strength, Christ and hope in the world. We are dead in trespasses and in sins, in darkness and under the power of Satan. Without the Resurrection our faith is vain. Without the mutual relation of Christ and His Church our Church relationship is a mere name. Without the plan of salvation our redemption is impossible. Without the Incarnation we have no Saviour. Although we cannot reason out these mysteries, we can reason out from them as the Bible declares them. The Inaugural Address seems to forget that the revered teacher of its author, Prof. Henry B. Smith, has said "Human reason may indeed inquire whether the voice that speaks be delusive or divine; it may test the truth of revelation on historical grounds; it may ask whether its doctrines be in harmony with or contradictory to moral truth, to our essential ideas and necessary convictions; it may inquire whether the problems it proposes to solve be real or imaginary; but, having answered such preliminary inquiries, it has no shadow of a right to go to this revelation and dictate to it what it shall tell us of God's nature or what shall be the method of the revelation or the redemption, any more than it has a right to go to that other reality, Nature, and prescribe its laws and limit its elements. In both cases man is to study and to learn."*

Notice the contrast between the spirit of the Inaugural and the first chapter of Dr. Archibald Alexander's *Evidences of Christianity*, entitled "The Right Use of Reason in Religion." "In receiving, therefore," says Dr. Alexander, "the most mysterious doctrines of Revelation, the ultimate appeal is to reason, not to determine whether she could have discovered these truths; not to declare, whether considered in themselves, they appear probable, but to decide whether it is not more reasonable to believe what God speaks than to confide in our crude and feeble conceptions. Just as if an unlearned man should hear an able astronomer declare that the diurnal motion of the heaven is not real, but only apparent; that the sun is nearer to the earth in

* Briggs' Bible Church and Reason (quotation), page 70.

Winter than in Summer. Although the facts asserted appear to contradict the senses, it would be reasonable to acquiesce in the declarations made to him by one who understood the subject and in whose veracity he had confidence. If, then, we receive the witness of men in matters above our comprehension, much more should we receive the witness of God, who knows all things and cannot deceive his creatures by false declarations."*

Therefore, I deny that the wilful depreciation of the means of grace is less sinful in the case of James Martineau and his school, whether its members be in England or America, than it is in me; that the use of the means of grace is less essential in James Martineau's case than in mine. In this respect the Inaugural Address is false to the Apostolic Commission. It breathes the spirit of the Scotch Moderatism that used to persecute Dr. Witherspoon, one of the framers both of our Church and national constitutions. It follows in the wake of the Unitarianism that leavened English Presbyterianism to its death in the Eighteenth Century. It recalls the word of Samuel Hanson Cox, one of the founders and long a director of the Union Theological Seminary, suggesting his description of an unsound minister to John Quincy Adams, as its doctrines belong to the "school of Cain";† that old founder of a religion without a Saviour; as it commends James Martineau, who, according to its statements, finds God without a mediator, an atonement and an Advocate, with the Father Jesus Christ the Righteous. The Bible tells us, through the Apostle Jude, of "reasoning that has gone in the way of Cain." Certainly such reasoning is not in the way of the Standards of the Presbyterian Church.

Looking up from what the school of higher criticism designates as the "*oi polloi*", of scholarship, I would venture to assert that James Martineau, great thinker as he is, could take a lesson in logic from Charles Darwin. The latter, on June 5th, 1879, addressed a letter to a young student in a German university, whose mind had been unsettled by reading his books, which reads as follows:

"SIR,—I am very busy, and am an old man in delicate health

* Alexander's Evidences of Christianity, page 11.

† Dr. S. H. Cox's Interviews, Memorable and Useful, page 239.

and have not time to answer your questions fully, even assuming that they are capable of being answered at all. Science and Christ have nothing to do with each other except in as far as scientific investigation makes a man cautious about accepting any proofs. As far as I am concerned, I do not believe that any revelation has ever been made. With regard to a future life every one must draw his own conclusions from vague and contradictory probabilities. Wishing you well, I remain your obedient servant,

CHARLES DARWIN."

This letter has been described as "unutterably sad." The fact set forth by Charge I. and its specifications makes the Inaugural Address "unutterably sad."

But Reason executes a perfect syllogism when it lays hold of the Bible, and hence of its doctrines as a reasonable book. No book is more rigid in its logic, or clearer in its conclusions. Reason meets the Bible with two questions: Does God speak? What does God say? Shut up to the acceptance of the evidences of the Divine revelation, and analyzing the matter of that revelation, "Reason will convince any man, unless he be of a perverse mind, that the Scripture is the Word of God; and then no reason can be greater than this—therefore it is true." * Thus Christ struck with dumbness the Pharisees and Scribes through their own Scriptures.

So that we are shut up to the confessional statement that Holy Scripture is most necessary. The Scripture citations show that Isaiah viii. 6, taught that it is as necessary as light to the eye; that Jesus Christ taught, (Matt. x. 32-33), that it is necessary as a revelation of Himself in order to the confession of Himself; that it is that necessary identical revelation (John v. 39); that it is so necessary as to furnish our only chart for departure into eternity (Luke xvi. 29-31); that it is necessary as a presentation of the truth as it is in Jesus, as the only way to God the Father (John xiv. 6). It is so necessary that to deny the record it gives of Christ is to challenge God's integrity (1 John v. 10); that the Galatians were given to understand that no other Gospel could take its place (Galatians i. 9); that it is the only manual of the

* Thirty Thousand Thoughts, page 263.

Christian worker (2 Tim. iii. 16); that it is the day-dawn of the day-star that guides us to heaven. And when the Scriptures teach that faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God,* they simply assert that the Holy Scripture is the rule of faith and practice. So that if faith be necessary the Holy Scripture is most necessary.

The "Acts of the Apostles" presents Paul more than once as a reasoner when he preached the Gospel. His reasoning concerning righteousness, temperance and judgment to come made Felix tremble. His epistles abound in the logical, *therefore*. God never reveals anything as true which contradicts any well-authenticated truth of intuition, experience or previous revelation. But this is not to assert that Reason is a fountain of Divine Authority (Hebrews xi. 1). Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Revised Version: "Faith is the assurance of things hoped for; the proving of things not seen." Thus Heaven itself declares that Reason's fountain of authority is the Word of God.

I pause here to consider the contradiction not only of the Scriptures and of the Standards, but of every Confession of Evangelical Christendom which is made by the last sentence of Specification II.

"Men are influenced by their temperaments and environments which of the three ways of access to God they may pursue."

Both the Scripture and the Standards assert that the Bible presents but one subject, has but one message for every phase of human temperament, for every sort of human environment, and that is repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. The subject of every miracle of healing performed by our Lord in nearly every case had his or her own environment, yet in every case there was the same condition of healing, "If thou canst believe." The Twelve Apostles of the Lord meant twelve peculiarities of temper; yet John wrote (I. John 2: 1), "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the Righteous." This statement is a denial of the sovereignty of Divine Grace, uproots the fact that justification is by faith alone, contradicts the law of the work of sanctification and hinges the

* Romans, x. 17.

possession of heaven on man's good pleasure. I cannot imagine how any one can read Romans vii. concerning Paul's conflict, Hebrews xii. concerning the weight and the easily-besetting sin that interfere with the Christian race and not teach that the Christian life is a battle with and a victory over human temperament and human environment.

CHARGE II.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a minister of the said Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that the Church is a fountain of Divine Authority, which, apart from the Holy Scripture, may and does savingly enlighten men, which is contrary to the essential doctrine of the Holy Scripture and of the Standards of the said Church, that the Holy Scripture is most necessary and the rule of faith and practice.

The examination of Charge I. necessarily anticipates much of the proof of Charge II. The attention of the court is invited to the Confessional citations which establish Charge II. In Chapter I., Section I., the Church appears, not as a fountain of Divine Authority, but as the receiver, preserver, propagator of that which flows from the Scripture, the fountain of Divine Authority. In Section V. the doctrine is that while the Church's testimony causes a "high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scripture, yet the Holy Ghost alone can insure our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and Divine Authority thereof. Section VI. shows that the completeness of the Scripture, as "the whole counsel of God," either expressly set down or deducible by good and necessary consequence, excludes the Church from doing the work of Scripture and compels the Church even in those matters which are left to human judgment to abide by its rules. Section VII. teaches that the Church cannot take the place of the Scripture, which is the supreme judge even of itself.

So that both Scripture and Standards teach that the Church is subordinate to the Bible. Hence with the Bible as the Church's sole warrant—as that without which the Church cannot

fulfill its mission of gathering sinners into the fold of Christ and of preparing saints for heaven; as that which so washes away the Church's earthliness, that the Church on earth becomes the spotless, unblemished, unwrinkled, holy, glorious Church of heaven, it is simply to twist logic clear out of shape into shapeless fallacy, to teach that although a person may strive never so hard he cannot obtain the knowledge essential to salvation from the Bible, but is compelled to turn away from the Bible and resort to the Church for said knowledge. And this too in the face of Section IV. of Chapter I. of the Confession, which says:

IV. "The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God, (who is truth itself), the author thereof, and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God."

True, the Church may bear witness to the Scripture just as it has been said, "A subject may bear witness to the identity of an heir to the crown, but the authority of the Scripture is no more derived from the Church than that of the king from the subject who proves that he is the legal heir."* Institutional Christianity is the presence chamber of God to no man until the Bible which makes the institution is in it. I turn from the Inaugural's Cardinal Newman to another famous churchman, the poet Dante, who evidently had an exact comprehension of the relation of the Church and Bible:

"Christ said not to his first conventicle:

Go forth and preach imposture to the world.

But gave them truth to build on, and the sound was mighty on their
lips; nor needed they

Beside the Gospel other spear or shield,

To aid them in their warfare for the truth."

The Inaugural certainly asserts that Spurgeon's position in the Kingdom of God is based on the immovable rock of the Divine Word. It certainly distinguishes the position of Newman from that of Spurgeon as it is based upon the perversion of Christ's word to Peter, as in the Papal Hierarchy Peter's person eliminates

* A. A. Hodge's Commentary on the Confession of Faith, pages 57-58

Peter's confession. I challenge the Inaugural's statement that the average opinion of the Christian world would not assign him (Spurgeon) a higher place in the Kingdom of God than Cardinal Newman. I believe that I voice the sentiment of the average Christian world when I say that I think he has a higher place in the Kingdom of God than Cardinal Newman. And further I believe that I voice the sentiment of the average Christian world when I say that Spurgeon fought a good fight, warred a good warfare, when he, holding according to the Inaugural the "Protestant position," assailed "the Church and the Reason in the interest of the authority of Scripture."

Skepticism and credulity have been called twin sisters. Charges I. and II. have shown that Dr. Briggs has attacked the authority of the Bible in the interest of the Reason and the Church, as exhibited in the skepticism of Martineau and the credulity of Newman. Having attacked the authority of the Bible, there was no escape from that impugment of its trustworthiness which is made the ground of Charge III.

INSPIRATION.

CHARGE III.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a Minister of the said Presbyterian Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that errors may have existed in the original text of the Holy Scripture, as it came from its authors, which is contrary to the essential doctrine taught in the Holy Scripture and in the Standards of the said Church, that the Holy Scripture is the Word of God written, immediately inspired, and the rule of faith and practice.

I will not read the specifications and proofs, unless called for.

Thus the Scriptures affirm the authenticity, the letter, the inspiration, the inerrancy, the infallibility, the unity, the accuracy, the truthfulness of God's Word written. The language not only of the law but of the messages of the prophets is emphasized in Zechariah vii. 12.

12. Yea, they made their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the law, and the words which the Lord of hosts hath sent in his Spirit by the former prophets; therefore came a great wrath from the Lord of hosts.

The term here rendered “words” is the plural of the noun derived from the verb (*dabar*), which according to Gesenius’ Lexicon, edited by Dr. Edward Robinson,* primarily signifies to set in a row, to range in order, to lead, to guide, to drive, to follow, be behind, and from the primary idea of ranging in order, connecting, comes also, the most frequent signification of this verb to speak, properly to set in order words, referring undoubtedly to the letters, which constitute the syllables and to the syllables which constitute the words, and to the words which constitute the sentences. Our Lord refers to the written Pentateuch in Mark vii. 13, when He charges the Pharisees and Scribes with “making the Word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.”

Commenting on the parallel passage in Matthew xv. Alford considers this a remarkable testimony of our Lord to the divine origin of the Mosaic law: not merely of the Decalogue, for the second command quoted is not in the Decalogue, and it is to be observed that where Matthew has *o theos eneteilato* (God said) Mark (7:10.) has “*Mousee eipen*,” Moses said: †

Let this Court observe how our Lord grasps the point of the question at issue, which is the question at issue in this case. He shows that the Pharisees and Scribes substituted their written tradition for the written word of God. In Geike’s Life of Christ, we read that “He who expounds the Scriptures in opposition to the tradition,” says Rabbi Eleazar, “has no share in the world to come.” “It was perhaps good to give one’s self to the reading of the Scripture, but he who reads diligently the traditions receives a reward from God, and he who gives himself to the commentaries on these traditions has the greatest reward of all.” “The Bible was like water, the traditions like wine, the commentaries on them like spiced wine.” “My

* Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon, Edited by Dr. Edward Robinson, pages 210–211.

† Alford’s Greek Testament, Vol. I., page 162.

Son," says the Talmud, "give more heed to the rabbis than to the Words of the law." *

Let the Court notice the specification under Charge III. If it means anything it shows that the scholarly critics of Christ's day did no more with their tradition than some modern scholars (I have seen a roll in a book entitled "The Bible, Church and Reason," which contains 145 names) do with the higher criticism as represented by the Inaugural. Indeed the specification shows that this Higher Criticism uses precisely the same processes which Christ rebukes in the citations from Mark vii. The Inaugural itself teaches that the thought of an inerrant original text is sheer assumption on which no mind can rest with certainty—declares that if an errant original text destroys the authority of the Bible, it is already destroyed for historians—ridicules the theory of an inerrant bible as "a ghost of modern Evangelicalism, to frighten children"—asserts that Historical Criticism actually points out errors, asserts that these errors are all in the circumstantial and not in the essentials, and suspends the fact of God's providential superintendence on its author's *maybe*. In view of the Bible and the Standards, this court can do nothing else than relegate the Inaugural to that tradition classified by Christ as making the word of God of non-effect. For the Higher Criticism exhibits itself in the Inaugural as at the behest and in the interests of that traditionalism of the olden time with which Jesus Christ contended during his earthly ministry.

The first and second chapters of the Epistles to the Romans leave Jew and Gentile alike subject to the law of God, alike under sin and condemnation. This conclusion opens the third chapter with a question and answer which simply make Charge III. luminous. Romans 3: 1-2. 1 What advantage then hath the Jew, or what profit is there of circumcision? 2 Much every way; chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.

If the Jew be no better than the Gentile he might well ask, in view of his past history, wherein he was better off than the Gentile. Paul shows the point of differentiation, as he writes "much

* Geike's Life of Christ, Vol. II., page 206 (Appleton's Edition).

every way;" chiefly because that unto them were committed (entrusted) the oracles of God, which means the Old Testament Scriptures as we have them. But the immediate relation of these verses to this discussion hinges on the term oracle. Besides Paul in this place, the protomartyr Stephen, designates the writings of Moses (Acts 7, 38), the Apostle Peter makes mention of the Scriptures which are to be the standard of speech (1 Peter, 4: 11), the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 5: 12) refers to the text book of the Christian teacher by the word oracle, Stephen calling them "the lively oracles," and the other two designating them the *oracles of God*. The fact that Paul was a Greek scholar, Stephen a Hellenistic Jew, and that Peter wrote at a time when Greece gave tone to the expression of thought, will show that, what the oracle was to the ancient Greek, so, according to the inspired Paul, the inspired Stephen (along with his reporter, the inspired Luke) and the inspired Peter, was the Bible to be to every son and daughter of Adam.

Now, if the Grecian oracle emphasized anything, it was the speech, the utterance, the words, the language of an authority which was divine, an idea to which poetry has given expression.

" O where Dodona! is thine ancient grove?
 Prophetic fount and oracle divine?
 What valley echoed the response of Jove?
 What trace remaineth of the Thunderer's Shrine?"

The Holy Ghost intended the popular meaning of the word when He called the Bible an oracle, and that it was the voice of Divine Authority is clearly apparent from the following, found in Grote's "History of Greece," Volume II., pages 255-256.

Volume II. (Pages 255-256): "Delphi and Dodona appear in the most ancient circumstances of Greece as universally venerated oracles and sanctuaries; and Delphi not only receives honors and donations, but also answers questions from Lydians, Phrygians, Etruscans, Romans, &c. It is not exclusively Hellenic. One of the valuable services which a Greek looked for from this and other great religious establishments was, that it should resolve his doubts in cases of perplexity, that it should advise him whether to begin anew or to persist in an old project, that it should foretell what would be his fate under given cir-

cumstances and inform him if suffering under distress on what condition the gods would grant him relief. We shall have constant occasion to notice in this history with what complete faith both the question was put and the answer was treasured up—what serious influence it often exercised both upon public and private proceeding. This habit of consulting the oracle formed part of the general tendency of the Greek mind to undertake no enterprise without having first ascertained how the gods viewed it and what measures they were likely to take. To sacrifice with a view to this or that undertaking, or to consult the oracle with the same view, are familiar expressions embodied in the language. Nor could any man set about a scheme with comfort until he had satisfied himself in some manner or other that the gods were favorable to it. The disposition here adverted to is one of those mental analogies pervading the whole Hellenic nation, which Herodotus indicates. And the common habit among all Greeks, of respectfully listening to the oracle of Delphi, will be found on many occasions useful in maintaining unanimity among men not accustomed to obey the same political superior."

Grote's History of Greece, Vol. IV., pages 405-409, gives a vivid narration of the efforts of the Athenians to interpret the utterances of the Delphian oracle at the time of the invasion of Xerxes.

No wonder, then, that Paul, Stephen, Luke and Peter called the Scriptures the oracles of God, for if the Grecian oracle was autocratic authority in the conception of every Greek, there is no higher law, no co-equal authority with the Bible's "Thus saith the Lord," which is *God's word written*. If the Grecian oracle was the centre of Hellenistic Unity, so this Bible is the centre of humanity's thought concerning its relation to God, whether ecclesiastical or rational. Dr. Schaff appropriately says (Lange on Romans, 3, 2, page 116): "The Apostle, in calling the Old Testament Scriptures the oracles of God, clearly recognizes them as divinely inspired books. The Jewish Church was the trustee and guardian of these oracles, till the Coming of Christ. Now the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are entrusted to the guardianship of the Christian Church." The

last two clauses of this quotation are very significant in the light of the present discussion. If the Church be the trustee and guardian of the Bible it can only discharge that trust, or do its work as guardian as it preserves and defends the letter of the Word of God. The instructors who subscribe to the doctrine of the Inaugural Address might do well to consider Hebrews 5:12: 'For when for the time ye ought to be teachers ye have need that one teach you again, which be the first principles of the oracles of God.' "

There is a categorical statement of verbal inspiration in

1 Cor. ii. 12, 14.—13 Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

So that while Bible inspiration is verbal inspiration, yet that inspiration is not merely mechanical. The Bible writers were not machines. No sane man thinks himself a machine. His free-agency will assert itself. You know that while man is not a machine, God controls his thoughts. Why should He not control his language? The meaning is that your Bible is what it is as to form of word, because God the Holy Ghost determined that it should be so.

When Paul wrote to the Galatians:

8 And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed, he simply based the doctrine of justification by faith on the Scripture—the writing, the letter—the verbal inspiration of Genesis 12:1-3.

Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee:

2 And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing:

3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

And Gen. 18:17-19.

17 And the Lord said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do:

18 Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him?

19 For I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.

The direct connection of the Holy Ghost with the language of Scripture is positively asserted in 2 Pet. i. (20-21):

20 Knowing this first that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation.

21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

Alford declares the sense to be that "*prophecy springs not out of human interpretation,*" *i. e.*, is not a prognostication made by a man who knows what he means when he utters it, "but, &c."* Or it may be explained by saying that no prophecy is of any man's individual interpretation of the mind of God respecting the future. The genesis of prophecy is not psychological. Prophecy is of Divine origin and, therefore, not a shrewd guess, nor uncertain, nor fallible.

The closing Scripture citation to sustain Charge III. is

2 Tim. iii. 16. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.

The rendering of the Revised Version, "Every Scripture inspired of God," is alike with the rendering of the Authorized Version an affirmation of God's Word written. The immediate reference is undoubtedly to the Holy Scriptures, to the Old Testament which Timothy had known from a child.

At the same time that the Revised Version of the text is incorrect is evident from the following summary of evidence: (1) The revisers condemned their own version by putting the

* Alford's Greek Testament, Vol. IV., page 401.

authorized text in the margin, for certainly "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" is not the equivalent of "every Scripture inspired of God." (2) The Greek Fathers, whose knowledge of the original language of the New Testament must be granted, set their seal to the Authorized Version, as we may learn from such men as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Basil, Cyril. (3) The peers of the best scholars of modern times refuse to give up the Authorized Version, among others Bishops Moberly, Wordsworth and Archbishop Trench of the Revision Committee, Dean Burgon, Dr. Scribner and Dr. Tregelles. The Revised Version according to Dean Burgon is "a calamitous literary blunder," and according to Dr. Scrivener "a blunder such as makes itself hopelessly condemned."*

As to the confessional testimony to Charge III., the Court will notice that in Chapter I., as Section I. teaches that the Lord committed the Bible to writing, as Section II. styles the Bible the Word of God written; calls by name the 66 books of the Old and New Testaments, affirming that they are our inspired rule of faith and practice, as Section IV. declares that God, the author, is truth itself, a doctrine is proclaimed concerning the "Word of God written," which is not found in the Inaugural, and especially in the Specification under Charge III. When the author of the Inaugural ventures to affirm that there are errors in the Scriptures, he ventures to contradict the *a priori* universal necessary prime postulate that God cannot lie. If the 66 books are inspired, the distinction which the author of the Inaugural makes between what he, by private interpretation, calls the essential and the circumstantial, involves the supposition that inspiration makes the Holy Ghost an active or a silent partner in a lie. We can only give up the circumstantial of Scripture so summarily ruled out by the Inaugural when we lose confidence in the Lord Jesus Christ's truthfulness. Every historical statement of the Bible is a chain of circumstances. I cannot look upon such a partial limited theory of inspiration without propounding the inquiry:

Where does this line of argument place the author of the

* Highest Critics (Munhall), pages 24-27.

Inaugural Address? I answer (1) He has subscribed to the Confession which names the 66 books of the Old and New Testaments as inspired of God. (2) He has declared that the Bible is not inerrant but errant. (3) He has declared that the errors are not merely by literary transcription, but the result of *original composition*. These propositions cannot be turned aside from the conclusion that inspiration does not necessarily guarantee *inerrancy*, *i. e.*, the whole Bible is inspired by the Holy Ghost, but a part of it is untrue. Such is not the deliverance of the last General Assembly.

This Bible is God's book. God is the thinker of its thought. And as language is the expression, the manifestation, not the mere dress of thought, God is the arranger of its clauses, the chooser of its terms and the speller of its words, so that the text, in its letters, words or clauses, is just as divine as the thought. There is a pretty general agreement with reference to the Bible as to its divine idea. The divergence commences as to the Bible's divine speech. And while I insist on its divine speech, I at the same time insist on my denial of the mechanical theory of inspiration. I want to draw an illustration from the title deed of a piece of property and from the chart of navigation. To discover the intention of the grantor of a deed of conveyance no one thinks of ignoring what the document says. The witnesses to the deed will only testify that they signed what is there written. The navigator's chart simply prints, if you please, the fact which the coast surveyor's mind apprehended, and the rock must remain hidden to the mariner unless the point on the chart indicates its locality. Hence, to assert that in the Bible God does not tell us what he thinks is to say that the grantor of a title deed can satisfy the grantee with a sheet of white paper, or that a coast surveyor can give the mariner the result of his work without a chart. Thus common sense dissolves into utter nothingness the assumption that the inspiration of the Bible is confined to the concept, which really means the same thing as the terms, notion, idea, purpose. But let the Bible speak for itself. From Genesis to Revelation it springs to the defense of its divine words. Our Bible term "Scripture" is *Kethab* in the

original Hebrew and *graphee* (noun) from *grapho* (verb) in the original Greek.

I think it very fortunate, Mr. Moderator, that in determining the significance of the Hebrew and Greek terms rendered into English by the word Scripture we can consult as our authority one whom not only Union Seminary, but the Christian world loves to honor, and whose name has been given to the Chair whose institution was the occasion of the Inaugural. I refer to Dr. Edward Robinson, the editor of the Hebrew Lexicon of Gesenius and of a Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament. Dr. Robinson designated the philological works of Gesenius as a specimen of what may be termed the historico-logical method of lexicography, which first investigates the primary and native signification of a word, and then deduces from it in logical order the subordinate meanings and shades of sense, as found in various constructions and in the usage of different ages and writers, which in short presents a logical and historical view of each word in all its varieties of signification and construction.* “This,” says Dr. Robinson, “is doubtless the only true method.” Now, Gesenius’ Lexicon, edited by Dr. Robinson, “*Ke.thab*,” in Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldaic, Syriac, Samaritan, means to write. Ethiopic letter book. The primary idea is to cut into, grave, since the earliest writing was probably graven on stones. To write, Ezra 4:7, referring to the letter which the enemies of the Jews wrote to Artaxerxes. To write words, discourses, Deuteronomy 10:2, as Moses tells the story of the tables of stone, Deuteronomy, 17:18, where the King was to write him a copy of the law. To write a book or record, Exodus, 32:32: as Moses speaks of the Book that God has written, II. Samuel, 11:14. The letter that David wrote Joab, concerning Uriah, the Hittite Job, 31:35. That word of Job, which is one of our most familiar proverbs, “That mine adversary had written a book,” Jeremiah, 36:27. Jeremiah’s celebrated roll, which Jehudi cut with his penknife. (b) The material or book upon which one writes. Chron. 20:29; the acts of David, as written in the books of the seers, Samuel, God and Nathan, the prophet. To inscribe, Isaiah, 44:5. “Another shall subscribe with his

* Gesenius’ Hebrew Lexicon (Robinson), Preface, page 4.

hand unto the Lord," in allusion to the ancient custom by which servants bore the names of their masters; "soldiers, those of their generals; idolators, those of their idols, cut or burnt in upon the forehead, hand, wrist." (c) The instrument, stylus, in connection, Is. 8:1. "Take thee a great roll and write in it with a man's pen, concerning Maher-shalal-hash-baz. (d) Connected with the person to or for whom one writes, II. Kings, 10:6. Jehu's letter to the rulers of Samaria, concerning Ahab's seventy sons. (e) To write of or concerning any one, Ps. 40:7. "In the volume of the book it is written of me."

(2) To write down. Neh. 33:2. "And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys."

(3) To write up, to inscribe in a register. Ps. 87:6. "The Lord shall count when he writeth up the people that this man was born there."

(4) To write about, to describe. Joshua 18:4, 6, 8. The survey commanded by Joshua. The Domesday Book.

(5) To write or record a sentence, edict or decree. Isaiah 65:6. "It is written before me."

(6) To write or record a law, to prescribe. II. Kings 22:13. Josiah and the law.

Under the noun we have the definition, a document, book, Dan. 10:21. The Book of Truth in which God's decrees are written.*

Now when we come to the New Testament we should bear in mind the statement of Dr. Robinson in the preface to his Lexicon, that the New Testament was written by Hebrews, "aiming to express Hebrew thoughts, conceptions, feelings, in the Greek tongue."† In that Lexicon we read that the verb *grapho* means (1) to write, to form letters, which was usually done with a stylus, so that the letters were graven or scratched upon the material. II. Thessalonians 3:17. "The salutation of Paul with mine own hand which is the token in every epistle: so I write," *i. e.*, "this is my handwriting."

(2) To write down anything. John 20:30-31. "These are written," &c., declarations, promises, prophecies. I. Cor. 10:11.

* Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon (Robinson), pages (495-496).

† Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament, Preface, page 6.

“Now all these things. . . . are written for our admonition, &c. Here belong the formulas of quotation from the Old Testament. To prepare in writing. Matt. 27:37. The superscription of the Cross.

(3) To write to any one. II. Pet. 3:15. “Our beloved Paul according to the wisdom given unto him (the concept), hath written unto you.” Very frequent in the Epistles. The noun *graphee*, a writing, is the Greek word for our English terms Scripture, the noun *gramma* being rendered so but once. II. Timothy 3:15. *

So says Dr. Edward Robinson, and I have found nothing in the analytical Hebrew and analytical Greek Lexicons, published by the Bagsters, to modify or change his statements.

Now all this proves nothing if it does not show that it is God’s mind that we should subscribe to the divinity of the letter no less than the thought of the Bible. In this sense, the Bible as a book is something more than mere print, as its words tell the story of Redemption—as its words are not such a development of the Hebrew and Greek into German and English, as to destroy the significance of the original tongues.

So that Paul wrote to Timothy, “From a child thou hast known the Holy Writ.” Jesus stands up in the synagogue of Nazareth and reads the words of Isaiah to say, “This day is this writing fulfilled in your ears.” Jesus explained the meaning of the words of Moses, of the prophets and of the Psalms when he opened to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus the writings: “Search the writings,” says the Man of Nazareth to the caviling Jews. “All the writings,” says Paul, “are given by inspiration of God.” A somewhat celebrated Scripture student has remarked “that the whole Epistle to the Romans turns on the meaning of a single word (*dikaioisunee*) righteousness, whose definition is given in Romans 3:25–26, and that there are five thousand instances in both the Old and New Testaments where most important distinctions hang upon the choice of a word, and even upon the delicate shading of meaning which distinguishes two words.”

Dr. Vincent says that a thorough comprehension of Scripture

* Robinson’s Lexicon of the New Testament, pages (152–153).

takes in the warp no less than the woof. See John 17: 8, 14, 17, 20, as our Lord emphasizes the letter of Scripture.

The most cursory reader of the Bible can scarcely fail to notice the emphasis it places upon its very words. Just as the sky at night is written all over with stars, so is the Bible written all over with the kindred phrases, "God said," "The Lord spake," "Thus saith the Lord," "The word of God," "The word of the Lord," "The ingrafted word." Peter's work on the Day of Pentecost is summed up in the statement: "And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation." The angels stand before Cornelius to say, "Send men to Joppa and call for Simon whose surname is Peter, who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house must be saved." God's last word in the Bible is an environment of the integrity of its letter. "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book. If any man shall add unto these things God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

But we may be told that this statement in the Apocalypse refers to the Book of Revelation alone. If we grant the assertion, the statement loses nothing of its force or significance. Any reference Bible will show the citation of nearly every other if not of every other book of the Scriptures in the Book of Revelation. Let any one look for himself and he will find the mere reading suggesting parallels as he goes along. Let us put this passage along with Matthew v. 19:

"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

And with Deuteronomy iv. 2:

"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the

commandments of the Lord your God which I command you."

And with Deuteronomy xii. 32:

"What thing soever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it."

Thus we find that the autocracy of God's word written is so absolute as not to permit us to add to or take from the words of this Bible, the unit, the whole of which Deuteronomy, Matthew and Revelation are three of the parts.

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus Christ not only denies the statement of the Inaugural that there is nothing divine in the letters, words and clauses of the Bible, but He goes further than that. Listen to Him. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets! I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law until all be fulfilled." Bishop Ellicott says, "The 'jot' is the Greek iota, the Hebrew yod, the smallest of all the letters of the alphabet. The tittle was one of the smaller strokes or twists of other letters, such, for example, as distinguished Delta from Rho, or Kappa from Beta." It was possible by the neglect or misuse of the jot or tittle to turn truth into nonsense or blasphemy.

Hence, if the law is of a piece with the whole Bible, there can be nothing superfluous or insignificant in that Bible. The jot and tittle are as divine as the concepts. The Inaugural's line of distinction between the essentials and the circumstantial is pronounced by the Bible to be an error. You cannot separate as to divine inspiration between the religion, faith and morals of the Bible and its other characteristics, *e. g.*, language, geography, history. If we cannot trust the *ipsisima verba* of the Divine writings when we want to learn the Divine will, what is there, asks another, that we can trust? And he goes on to say:

"One jot, one *yod*, a little thing that is not a letter in itself so much as the adjunct and helper of some other letter—a yot, a silent thing. The name of the wife of Abraham was turned from Sarai to Sarah, and it was the *yod* that did it; it was that little silent insignificant adjunct that turned her into Princess. God is careful of His *yod*, or *yot*, or *jot*. He does not dot His *i* for

nothing, nor cross His *t* merely for decoration." If the jot, the tittle, the iota, the subscript, the accent, the breathing point be essential in God's plan, what must we say of an attempt to wipe out the letters, words, clauses, circumstantials of God's written word?

The prominence of the human ear as a factor of redemption lifts the language of the Bible to the pedestal of inspiration. The door of responsibility opens as the Sermon on the Mount reaches the climax of application in the phrase, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine," "The Parable of the Sower presents man in four aspects as a hearer. Down comes from heaven the warning. Take heed what ye hear." Seven letters have come from the great white throne, every one of which bears the postscript: He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.

Dr. Briggs cannot escape the logic of the skeptic, who says: "Any thoughtful person will see that the moment you begin to doubt the verbal inspiration, the literal accuracy of the Scriptures, you start on a road which will logically lead you to reject the Scriptures entirely as a book of divine revelation, or go back to the theory of verbal inspiration. There is no logical stopping place between verbal inspiration and no inspiration. If you admit that a single word or even line of the Bible was not directly dictated by God, the authority of the book is overthrown, for by making this admission you decide that human reason may sit in judgment on the word of God, which is absurd."

So the Bible as God's book teaches that the concept without the word to manifest it is an unknown quantity—a lamp without a light, a messenger without a message. What would we know of Shakespeare's concept without his imperishable sentences? Of Edmund Burke's concept without his polished periods? Of Walter Scott's concept without the word creations of the Waverley Novels? Of Longfellow's concept without the Village Blacksmith, the Psalm of Life and Hiawatha? What would we know of the Bible concept of man's fallen condition if it were not for the story of Eden (and it is no cunningly devised fable either), of Sinai, of Bethlehem and of Calvary? What would we know of the Bible concept of faith and

repentance if it were not for the histories of which the Eleventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews is an epitome, if it were not for what the Bible tells circumstantially of the impenitent antediluvians, of righteous Noah, faithful Abraham, wrestling Jacob, penitent David, restored Peter? The Bible concept of the completeness of our salvation appears as it writes down that last shout from the victorious cross, "It is finished." Its concept of the welcome which the Father will give to the returning sinner appears in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. O Christian, is it not something to have the Bible concept of heaven set forth in the words, "There shall be no night there; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain." O afflicted one, is it not something to have the Bible concept of trial set forth in those weighty, stirring words of the Eighth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, which show why "all things work together for good to them that love God; to them who are the called according to His purpose"? Is it not something for us preachers to be able to tell sinners that the Bible concept of God's attitude toward them is set forth in the word that saved Nicodemus, the Ethiopian eunuch and the Philippian jailer? Yes, the Bible concept so inerrant is clothed in a word so inerrant that, as I have read somewhere, if I mistake not, Moses does not adopt Manetho's system of chronology, Daniel does not insert the monstrous cosmogonies of the Babylonians, and Paul never writes a word concerning Augustine's denial of the antipodes.

In the case of the Bible mystery the concept is a thing that we cannot reason out. So we are shut up to the Bible word.

I come now to take up the Confessional Proof of Charge III., and remark that Chapter I. of the Confession, Sections 2 and 8, locate God's word written in our Bible, translated into English out of the original tongues, with its fifty authors, its 66 books, its Old and New Testaments, its law, prophets, and Psalms, Gospels and Epistles. The Gospels and the Epistles reciprocally confirm each other. The New Testament confirms the Old directly in 263 instances, and indirectly in upwards of 350 cases. The Septuagint in the case of the Old Testament, and the

Christian Fathers in the case of the New, bear testimony to the authenticity of the present canon. Thus our Bible contains the very Pentateuch that Isaiah called law and testimony—the Psalmist, God’s exceeding broad commandment which was received by the Sadducees, expounded by Paul to the Galatians; quoted by Jesus in the Temptation (from Deuteronomy, pronounced by the Inaugural’s school of Higher Criticism a fraud); enforced by the Sermon on the Mount; rescued by our Saviour from the glosses of the Pharisees and Scribes. Our Bible contains that which Paul, Stephen, Luke, Peter call the Oracles of God. Our Bible is the only record that God has given of His Son. The third gospel is called in its “Acts of the Apostles,” the former treatise which Luke wrote to Theophilus. We read in it the very gospel preached to Abraham, the very Scriptures which Christ called upon the Jews to search; the very Deuteronomy and Revelation which will admit neither addition nor subtraction; the very Word of the Law, for which Jeremiah suffered; the very Law Prophets and Psalms searched by the Bereans and opened unto Apollos by Aquila and Priscilla. Let us recall Confession of Faith, Chap. I., Sec. 8.

VIII. The Old Testament in Hebrew, (which was the native language of God of old,) and the New Testament in Greek, (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations,) being immediately inspired by God, and by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; so as in all controversies of religion the Church is finally to appeal unto them. But because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God who have right unto, and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded, in the fear of God, to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship Him in an acceptable manner, and through patience and comfort of the Scriptures may have hope.

Thus, Mr. Moderator, according to Sec. 8, Chapter I. of the Confession, the authority of your and my Bible as God’s Word written, depends upon the fact that it is the outgrowth of the

original Hebrew and Greek, by which the revelation of God was conveyed from Heaven to the children of men. The Presbyterian Church holds that our English Bible is what it is, because the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament of the original inerrant autograph of the Sacred Record are what they are. If this be not the case, the Chair of Old Testament Hebrew, and the Chair of New Testament Greek in our theological seminaries, aye, the Edward Robinson Chair of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, are in each case an anomaly; Dr. Schaff was engaged in a work of supererogation, when he translated portions of the Scriptures for Lange's Commentary; Dr. Vincent's Word Studies in the New Testament have no especial significance; Dr. Briggs' "Biblical Study" has not even the ghost of an excuse for its publication. The Inaugural says "the divine authority is not in the style or in the words, but in the concept, and so the divine power of the Bible may be transferred into any human language. The Divine Authority contained in the Scriptures speaks as powerfully in English as in Greek, in Choctaw as in Aramaic, in Chinese as in Hebrew."* I modify and correct the statement by declaring that the Divine Authority is in the concept, as set forth in the style and words of the Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic languages. That particular style and those particular words by which the Bible writers have transmitted God's Word to men must determine the style and words of our English, our Choctaw and our Chinese Bibles. For it is a sound principle that "the veracity of the truth transmitted must be equivalent, neither more nor less, to the accuracy of the word which conveyed it."

With respect to the original language of the Old Testament, I quote the especially significant statement of Dr. W. Robertson Smith, that the Septuagint confirms the substantial accuracy of our Hebrew Bible. The Jews, whose advantage over the Gentiles consisted, according to Paul (Romans iii. 3), in their divinely authorized trusteeship of the oracles of God, were never accused of unfaithfulness to their trust, as to the care of the Scriptural text. Prof. Charteris tells us that "the Jews of Palestine regarded Hebrew as the language of inspiration, and the old Hebrew books alone as the Sacred Canon." Language

* Inaugural, Third Edition, pages 31-32.

and logic simply mean nothing to those who deny that the Old Testament text as it stands was accepted by Christ and the Apostles, by all the writers of the New Testament, and by the Jews of their day. Indeed, there are things in the New Testament we must deny, if the Old Testament be not authentic, such as the Incarnation of Christ; Paul's presentation of sin and redemption in the Epistle to the Romans, and the whole spirit and letter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

With respect to the original language of the New Testament I call attention to an article by Prof. G. P. Wright in the *Homiletic Review* of April, 1886. "According to the latest and best authority," says Prof. Wright, "seven-eighths of the words of the New Testament have passed the ordeal of textual criticism without question; of the remaining one-eighth only a small fraction are subject to reasonable doubt; so that fifty-nine sixtieths of the words of the New Testament, as they came from the original authors, are known with practical certainty. And even of the one-sixtieth open to question, the larger part of the doubt pertains to changes of order in the words and other comparative trivialities; so that, according to Westcott and Hort, "The amount of what can in any sense be called substantial variation is but a small fraction of the whole residuary variation, and can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text."

Just here it is well to note that the greatest and most eminent scholars who have been foremost in discovering manuscripts and tabulating variations of the text have been men who believed in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. I name Robert Stephen, Mill, Bentley, the great Bengel, Beza, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Scrivener, Burgon. Says Bentley, "The more the manuscripts, the greater the certainty and the less likelihood of deception." Bengel, who increased the list of variations, is thus mentioned by Ellicott, "He was a verbal critic, mainly because he believed in verbal inspiration."

Dr. Briggs is known in Europe as well as America as a leading investigator of questions relating to the original tongues of the Scriptures. In his response to the Charges and Specifications last November he announced that he would pay no respect to anything that was not rendered in Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek.

He thus confessed his slavery to literalism, which is condemned both by Scripture, precept and example. He requires more than was demanded of the Ethiopian Eunuch. A remark by Dr. Cunningham Geike is in point here. "In Acts 8:22, Philip is introduced as reading through the Ethiopian Eunuch the seventh and eighth verses from the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. But curiously he again quotes from the Greek translation of the Bible, not from the Hebrew, the Ethiopian having that with him and doubtless knowing nothing of the original language. Nor does the Evangelist make any remark to him on the variations in the translations he was reading from the text of the Hebrew, which was canonical and inspired, while that of the Septuagint was made by uninspired scholars—a fact which silences forever any objection such as that if we are to learn from Scripture the real will of God, we must go to the original."*

And as good a scholar, ecclesiastical or secular, as there is in the Presbyterian Church or in the United States of America tells us that the supreme and paramount question which is involved in Charge III. and its Specification is a question "for every minister and every layman to settle for himself; and, happily, it is one which, in all the fullness of its importance, needs no technical criticism to aid in its solution, but which every man of ordinary education, common sense, and knowledge of the English Bible, alone is competent to decide. The burning question is one that needs no knowledge of either Greek or Hebrew as a preparation to answer it."

Thus the great body of the membership of the Church has a substantial Scriptural reason for its pronounced earnest opposition to the Inaugural Address. Just as the Greek was near enough to the Hebrew for the Eunuch to understand the plan of salvation, so is the English of the Authorized and Revised Versions near enough to the Hebrew, the Aramaic and the Greek for the most unlearned Presbyterian, to say nothing of other Christian denominations, to understand that the Inaugural contradicts both the Bible and the system of Bible doctrine which is the distinctive mark of the Presbyterian Church.

It would be hard to find a reader of the Bible who fails to observe its frequent affirmation of its own accuracy as God's

**Sunday School Times*, January 16th, 1892.

word written. The Nineteenth Psalm follows a description of the perfection of God's Book of Nature with the declaration:

"Ps. xix. 7. The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple,"

which declaration, says Dr. Briggs in Lange on Psalms, page 153, refers to God's Word and the Revelation of His will.

I note two instances in which Dr. Schaff gives us a vivid appreciation of the accuracy of the Scriptures. The first is

Luke i. 1 to 4. Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us. 2 Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word; 3 It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, 4 That thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.

Dr. Schaff, in Lange on Luke, renders thus: Forasmuch as many have taken in hand *to draw up a narration* concerning the things fulfilled among us even as those handed them down unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, It seemed good to me also, having *accurately* traced down all things from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, That thou mightest know *accurately* the certainty of those words or doctrines wherein thou hast been catechised. The second is that petition of Christ's intercession prayer,

"John xvii. 17. Sanctify them, through thy truth: thy word is truth,"

in which he teaches that "truth" here is the predicate of the word.

"What was true of the oral proclamation of the word—

1 Thess. ii. 12. 'For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe,'

holds good of the written," says Lange, p. 43. "For the rela-

tion between word and writing (quoting from Martensen) is ordinarily this, that the writing compresses the copiousness of the spoken word into a settled elementary form—the final expression made clear and strong by deliberate reflection of the inspired thought—and so in Holy Scripture we have the ripe, developed fruit of inspiration.”

Hence, we must take direct issue with the statement of Biblical Study, pages 411 and 412, cited and read by the defendant as evidence. “Inspiration has to do with the truthfulness, reliability, accuracy and authority of the Word of God.” These attributes are said to be those that “make the Bible what it is in the life of the people and the faith of the Church, without raising the question of inspiration.” I think that it would be better to say, “Inspiration insures the truthfulness, reliability, accuracy and authority of the Word of God.” It is to sever the stream from its parent fountain to talk of these Bible attributes without raising the question of inspiration. These Bible attributes hold a somewhat different relation from the same attributes in connection with the ledger of a counting-room. In my discussion of the subject of inspiration yesterday, while I set forth very definitely my own doctrine as to the extent of inspiration, I wish to remind the Presbytery that it is not claimed that the theory of the mode or manner of inspiration should be made a test of orthodoxy. It was my object to show that the theory of inspiration taught by the accused was virtually a denial of inspiration in any true sense. It was not my object to present a theory of inspiration which this Court must accept in order that the theory of Prof. Briggs should be condemned. I object to the theory that the concept alone is inspired, and have endeavored to show that it is the truth which is inspired.

Let the Court, before leaving the consideration of Charge III., attend to the relation of Jesus Christ to the Bible. He is the character of its story, the subject of its doctrine, the resultant of its logic, the reason of its existence. So He says Himself. He came to fulfil the law. The Scriptures testify of Him. The law, the Prophets and the Psalms were written concerning Him. Abraham saw His day. David spoke of Him. Isaiah prophesied of Him. So say the Epistles, as they proclaim that

the Christ of the New Testament is the identical Christ of the Old Testament. The Eleventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews shows Christians of all ages looking to Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith. Listen to Him as He answers Philip's petition: "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us." Have I been so long a time with you and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; thereby teaching the disciple that when he looked on Christ he beheld the image of God, the Father.* And when Jesus, our High Priest, makes the prayer of intercession, and says: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their Word,"† how can any one escape the conclusion that He whom Philip saw in the Word made flesh, we, when the Holy Spirit makes the Scripture a means of grace to our soul, see in the Word made Bible? This truth is expounded by Paul in II. Cor. iv. 3-6.

3 But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost.
 4 In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.
 5 For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. 6 For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

The fact that the gospel of the Bible revealed the image of Christ as He manifested the image of the Father was the reason of the method of Paul's ministry. This appears from the preceding context:

II. Cor. Chapter IV. (1-2).

1 Therefore, seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not. 2 But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but, by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

For "walking in craftiness nor handling the word of God de-

* John 14: (8-9).

† John 17:20.

ceitfully," Conybeare and Howson have "I walk not in the paths of cunning, I adulterate not the word of God."* For "handling the word of God deceitfully," Lange has "nor falsifying the word of God."†

Now, just as the human body which tabernacled the Second Person of the Trinity was the very man who was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners, who was tempted in all points as we are yet without sin, who did all things well, whose challenge could not be met, "which of you convinceth me of sin," who was absolutely perfect, absolutely spotless, absolutely infallible; so the human medium which tabernacles Jesus Christ the Word made Bible must, but be as perfect, as spotless, as infallible. If it took a perfect man to exhibit a perfect God it takes a perfect Bible to exhibit a perfect Christ. There must be no spots on this Parthenon. There must be no faults in this mirror. There must be no errors in this original text. There must be nothing in circumstantials to detract from its infallibility. There must be nothing in the human setting to detract from the perfection of God's workmanship in the precious jewel. I say it in all humility, Mr. Moderator, but in the honest conviction of my soul, that the Bible as presented in the Inaugural Address is not Jesus Christ the Word made Bible. Let Rev. Hugh Martin's *Christ's Presence in the Gospel History* (published some thirty years ago) confirm my position.

Referring to John 17: 20, we read, "If Jesus Christ looketh forth upon me now from their word by His Spirit, the Spirit lighting up that very word as it has been written, and Jesus thereby looking forth exactly to the very life as that written word, if I may so say, permits Him," then my Beloved fairer than the sons of men chiefest among ten thousand—is to me altogether lovely and the express image of the Father only if this word be exactly what the Spirit of Christ would have written as holy men of God were moved by the Spirit—an inspired record and perfect.

And the Gospel biography is of a piece with the whole Scrip-

* Conybeare & Howson, *Life and Epistles of Paul*, Randolph's Edition, page 447.

† Lange on II. Corinthians, page 64.

ture, as we read: "That He should enter into it; identify Himself with it; make it vital with His living power and vocal with His own personal voice; make it from age to age the dwelling-place of His Presence; the definition, the circumspection, the expression of His gracious Presence; committing Himself; thoroughly, contentedly, cordially committing Himself to all generation to be judged as He appears there; this I cannot believe unless the biography answers His own great idea of what His own biography should be. It must be perfect; even in all the perfection that Christ Himself can give to it; yea, in all the perfection He can claim for Himself. It must be an image as perfect in its kind, in written words, of Jesus—as Jesus is the perfect image in human flesh of the Eternal Father. The coalescence of the Presence and the Biography demand it. Nay, it must be an Autobiography. Jesus Himself must be the author of it—by His Spirit." *

Thus we have shown whom we see under this inward illumination of the Spirit—at whose feet we sit as we take in this Scripture which is the voice of the Holy Ghost.

This line of argument is confirmed by page 365 of Biblical Study cited and read by the defendant as evidence as he subscribes to the doctrine that "the Holy Spirit as the Supreme interpreter of Scripture is the highest attainment of interpretation." Is it any wonder, therefore, that Section V., Chapter I., insists upon the entire perfection of Holy Scripture?

Therefore from the first verse of Genesis to the last verse of Revelation this Holy Scripture is God's Word written, is immediately inspired, and is the rule of faith and practice.

CHARGE IV.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a Minister of the said Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch, which is contrary to direct statements of Holy Scripture, and to the essential doctrines of the Standards of the said Church,

* *Family Treasury* (First Half-Year, 1860), pages 349-350.

that the Holy Scripture evidences itself to be the Word of God by the consent of all the parts, and that the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself.

I will not read the Specification. From what source are we to derive competent testimony with reference to the questions involved in Charge IV. and Specification? Evidently from the Bible alone, inasmuch as it contains the only really authoritative history on the subject, and its structure makes it the only qualified interpreter of its own statements. While it is one book, yet it is the product of fifty authors, each independent of the other and each an independent witness.

The Gospel History of Jesus Christ shows him as the Great Witness Bearer, constantly appealing to the belief of men. He told Pilate: "To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."* His parting charge to the disciples was: "Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me, or else believe me for the very work's sake."† As a voucher for His competency and credibility, He introduces the Father: "The Father Himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me."‡ God the Holy Ghost vouches for the same. "When the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father He shall testify of me."§ The author of the Inaugural vouches for the same, as he says that "the authority of Jesus Christ, to those who know Him to be their Divine Saviour, outweighs all other authority whatever."

Jesus Christ is noted by the Gospel writers as bearing testimony to the existence, the identity of the Scriptures as God's written word twenty-four times. And that He intended the Old Testament as we have it is evident from the fact that "the most imaginative of modern writers will not call into question that the books of the Old Testament, as we have them now, were in existence at the time of the translation of the Septuagint, or that they were acknowledged among the Jews all over the world, or

* John 18:37.

† John 14:11.

‡ John 5:37.

§ John 15:26.

that they were regarded by them with a reverence so great that it ran into superstition and may almost be regarded as idolatrous."

We know that our Lord challenged the belief in Himself on the ground of the belief of the Jews in the person whom He authenticated as the Author of the Pentateuch. "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you—even Moses, whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how can ye believe my words?"*

If Moses did not write the Pentateuch, no Jew can be blamed for not accepting Christ.

So that, when the Inaugural Address asserts that—

Page 33, "It may be regarded as the certain result of the science of the Higher Criticism that Moses did not write the Pentateuch,"

it simply gives expression to the profane idea that our Lord was dishonest. To say that He was ignorant of the discoveries by which the higher critics eliminate Moses from the Pentateuch is to say that we are not to trust a single promise recorded by the Gospel writers as made by Him.

As we turn over the four Gospels to find citations from the Pentateuch, we find that Matthew 19, 17: 9 is a quotation from Deuteronomy; Mark 7: 10, from Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy; Luke 20: 28, 37, from Exodus and Deuteronomy; John 1: 45, from Genesis and Deuteronomy; John 5: 45-47, from Genesis and Deuteronomy; John 7: 19, 22, 23, from Genesis, Leviticus and Deuteronomy. The Abraham, Isaac and Jacob of Genesis are the subject of Christ's frequent mention. The pass-over of Exodus found its explanation in His Cross. The book of Leviticus furnished His direction to the healed leper. The brazen serpent of Numbers was His text in the sermon to Nicodemus. We have seen that Exodus and Deuteronomy furnished Him the weapon that vanquished Satan. I find that, in the four Gospels, Jesus Christ, directly or indirectly, refers to Genesis twelve times; to Exodus, twelve; to Leviticus, fifteen; to Numbers, three; to Deuteronomy, twenty. So that He, without

* John 5: (45-47).

whom not anything was made that is made; without whom not anything became that did become; by whom all things consist knows nothing of the Higher Criticism's discovery of the pseudo-Moses of the Deuteronomy, which never saw the light until the men of Josiah's day palmed it off on their king--of Ezra, as a pious fraud; of Daniel, as a pseudonym.

Thus the testimony of other books of Scripture, with reference to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch being countersigned by Jesus Christ the Truth, is as indisputable and irresistible as a mathematical axiom. Let us consider a brief outline of what it says. The Pentateuch itself, in Exodus 24: 4, Numbers 33: 2, Deut. 5: 31 (Appointment) Deuteronomy 31: 9, affirms that Moses is its author. It may be objected that Moses himself always appears in the third person. But the Pentateuch is a history, not an autobiography. The centre of interest in Thomas H. Benton's "Thirty Years in the United States Senate," and in James G. Blaine's "Twenty Years in Congress," is, in each case, undoubtedly the personality of the author. The authorship of these books is not questioned, however, because the authors appear in the third person.

In Joshua I. (7: 8), I. Kings 2: 3, we have the testimony of God; in Joshua 8: 31, the testimony of his cotemporaries, one of whom was Joshua, his chosen friend (testimony of Boswell, concerning Johnson; of John Marshall, concerning George Washington; of John G. Nicolay and John Hay, concerning Abraham Lincoln); in I. Kings 2: 3, again the testimony of David, who sings in many a Psalm the Pentateuchal history (as Walter Scott sings the early traditions of Scotland, or as Tennyson sings the historic Britain); in Ezra 3: 2, 6: 18, Neh. I. 7-8, Neh. 13: 1, the testimony of the whole Jewish nation; in I. Chronicles 6: 49, the testimony of the carefully kept genealogical roll of the Hebrews; in Daniel 9: 1, the testimony of one whose memorable prayer shows his familiar acquaintance with his country's history; in Romans 10: 19, the testimony of Paul, both a Hebrew and Greek scholar; in Acts 3: 22, the testimony of Peter when the Gospel was on trial before the Jewish Sanhedrim; in Acts 7: 37-38, the definite testimony of Stephen and of Luke, his reporter, as the definite pronoun is applied to Moses—all affirming the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

The Inaugural Address put forth no novelty, not even in America, when it heralded the assertion of the Higher Criticism to the contrary. In 1794-95 a book appeared which contains the following statements concerning the Pentateuch. Referring to Deuteronomy it is said that "the style and manner of writing marks more evidently than in the former books that Moses is not the writer." He then founds an argument on the mention of "Dan" (a place) in Genesis 14: 14, and on the mention of a kingship in Israel, Genesis 36: 31, and cites these cases as "showing therefrom, as in the preceding case, that Moses is not the author of the book of Genesis." His final conclusion is "that the book of Genesis, though it is placed first in the Bible and ascribed to Moses, has been manufactured by some unknown person after the book of Chronicles was written, which was not until at least eight hundred and sixty years after the time of Moses."

It may astonish some of us to know that these extracts are from Thomas Paine's "Age of Reason." I was not so much astonished when I read in the English Baptist Magazine of June, 1891, an account of those high priests of the Higher Criticism, Wellhausen and Kuenen. The writer notes "the bitterness, the contempt and the vindictive spitefulness which Wellhausen takes every possible opportunity of venting in respect to the religious motives and aims of these Old Testament writers who prepared the ground for our distinctively Christian doctrines of Sacrament and Atonement, the Priestly work of our Lord, and the Sovereign Grace by which alone regeneration and sanctification are ours."

Kuenen is mentioned as speaking less offensively concerning "the fictions of the Pentateuch and the superstitions and interested motives of their authors."

The writer further speaks of "the attitude of the great body of Higher Criticism on the Continent" as "one of avowed hostility to pious faith in a Divine Redeemer, and to a supernatural revelation of forgiveness through the sacrifice of Calvary."

So these German critics have no reason to find fault with

Thomas Paine, and before the Presbytery of New York sets its seal of approval upon the Inaugural's conclusion that Higher Criticism has overthrown the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the brethren may well give heed to an English Bishop who must have had the Broad Church critics in mind when he wrote: "They cannot divide Moses and Christ. If they do not believe the one, they will find sooner or later that they do not believe the other. If they begin with casting off Moses and not believing his writings, they will find in the end that to be consistent they must cast off Christ. If they will not have the Old Testament, they will discover at last that they cannot have the New. The two are so linked together that they cannot be separated." How can this Court say otherwise than "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder." *

CHARGE V.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D. D., being a Minister of the said Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name, which is contrary to direct statements of Holy Scripture and to the essential doctrines of the Standards of the said Church, that the Holy Scripture evidences itself to be the word of God by the consent of all the parts, and that the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself.

The assertion that Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name is answered, with one exception, by quotations from that portion of the Book of Isaiah which the author of the Inaugural Address in his Biblical Study and "Messianic Prophecy" ascribed to another person solely on the basis of the "may be" of higher criticism. Mr. Moderator, if according to the line of proof which has been introduced Moses be the author of the Pentateuch we are shut up to the conclusion, that Isaiah is the author of the whole of the book which bears his name. There-

* Ryle on John, Vol. I., page 322.

fore the may of the higher criticism cannot hold its place before the *must* not of traditionalism, not of blind conservatism, but the *must* of the competency, the credibility, the divine authority of Jesus Christ as a witness, and of the competency, the credibility, the divine authority of the writers of the New Testament as witnesses. In the third Gospel, (Luke 3:4), we have Luke (the preface to whose gospel according to Dr. Schaff vouches for his accuracy), Paul (the friend of Luke who, we would say for the benefit of the Higher Critics, may have had some agency in the production of his gospel) and John the Baptist identifying Isaiah as the author of the Fortieth Chapter. In Luke 4:17-18, we have Jesus Christ as He set up the banner of His earthly ministry at Nazareth, Luke and Paul, identifying Isaiah as the author of the Sixty-first Chapter. In John 12:38-41, we have John the Apostle identifying Isaiah as the author of the Fifty-third Chapter. In Romans 10:16, 20, Paul identifies Isaiah as the author of the Fifty-third and Sixty-fifth Chapters.*

“The array of linguistic evidence in proof of a diversity of authorship,” says Prof. Daniel S. Talcott, of Bangor Theological Seminary, “rests very largely on an assumption which none of these critics have the hardihood distinctly to vindicate, namely, that within the narrow compass of the Hebrew literature that has come down to us from any given period, we have the means for arriving at an accurate estimate of all the resources which the language at that time possessed. When we have eliminated from the list of words and phrases relied upon to prove a later date than the time of Isaiah, everything the value of which to the argument must stand or fall with this assumption, there remains absolutely nothing which may not be reasonably referred to the reign of Hezekiah. Indeed, considering all the circumstances of the times, it might justly have been expected that the traces of foreign influence upon the language would be far more conspicuous in a writing of this date than they actually are in the controverted portions.”

“Probably there is not one of all the languages of the globe, whether living or dead, possessing any considerable literature which does not exhibit instances of greater change in the style of an author writing at different periods of his life than appears

* Other examples. Matthew 4: (14-15) refers to Isaiah 9:1; Matthew 12: (17-18) to Isaiah 42:1; Acts 28: (25-26) to Isaiah 6:9.

upon a comparison of the later prophecies of Isaiah with the earlier." *

Every member of this Court knows that our own literature abounds in such instances. Literary style varies with the age, circumstances or idiosyncrasies of the writer.

There is the noted Junius, whose identity has baffled the curiosity of four generations of critics; no one has been able to detect him in any of the contemporary writers of his day. When Walter Scott, the poet, appeared in the Waverley Novels, the transformation was so complete as to puzzle his intimate friends. The same Hawthorne wrote the "Twice-Told Tales" and the letters which came to the State Department from the Liverpool Consulate. America has a banker poet, and, because he writes a poem, is he any the less the writer of the letter to his business correspondent? To some of us the Inaugural itself is a case in point, as we wonder at the facility with which the same pen inscribes what we deem contradictory statements.

The author of the Inaugural says in "Biblical Study": "The presumption of the New Testament is in favor of the authorship of Isaiah." We affirm that the evidence of the New Testament is in favor of the authorship of Isaiah, as the author of the Inaugural once taught.

In a late production of the author of the Inaugural, entitled "The Bible, Church and Reason," he answers the question "Who are the Higher Critics?" Appendix, p. 236, by giving a list of 145 persons who are said to "stand in solid phalanx against the traditional theory that Moses is responsible for our Pentateuch in its present form, and that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book which bears his name." In this list I read the names of Julius Wellhausen, Ernest Renan, Abraham Kuenen, Thomas K. Cheyne, Samuel R. Driver, W. Robertson Smith, Arthur P. Stanley, John William Colenso, Crawford H. Toy, William R. Harper, R. Heber Newton, Washington Gladden, John W. Chadwick. The merest tyro in criticism does not need to be told; indeed, it is the common report, that this solid phalanx is so solid that its members cannot agree among themselves;

*Smith's Bible Dictionary (edited by Professor Hackett), Article Isaiah, Vol. II., page 1165.

so solid, that of the theories which they and their fellows have formulated, 747 have by actual count been exploded or have given up the gospel. An investigation would show, I doubt not, that the whole list, with the exception of a few names is, as to doctrine and practice, anything but Presbyterian. It is but fair to say that any in this list who acknowledge that they are atheists or agnostics or rationalists or Bible iconoclasts will not be regarded by Presbyterian Church courts generally as competent or credible witnesses with respect to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or with respect to the unity of Isaiah.

And how can they be Presbyterian when the root principle of the Higher Criticism, as expounded by the author of the *Inaugural*, is the fallacy which, as noted by another, "hinges on the absence of testimony as to facts."

The late Dr. Mendenhall, editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, made a journey to Europe, chiefly for the purpose, as he writes, of investigating the critical biblical questions that have been and are still in discussion between conservative and rationalist critics. This purpose was carried out in extended interviews with thirty-one of the prominent professors in Germany and eight professors in England, besides numerous interviews with other scholars in those countries and in Scotland and France. He came home to write an editorial on "The Crime of the Higher Criticism," as he learned it from the school whose members are named in the roll which appears in "The Bible, Church and Reason," and introduced by Dr. Briggs as evidence. From that editorial I make the following extract: "Results, not conclusions, are in order. It is a crime, with the former incomplete and undetermined, to declare the latter. It is a crime to foist probabilities into the air when under analysis they turn out to be the unsupported inventions of theorists. It is a crime to dignify a conjecture with all the proportions, strength, and character of a real fact, and to substitute the one for the other. It is a crime to turn the Bible into a sporting ground for theorists, who, unrestrained by conscience or the Christian faith, and neglectful even of intellectual order and honesty, assail the great writers of the Old Testament with invective and *hauteur*, assign its books to periods and authors that neither history nor

logic will support, eliminate the supernatural element with the fervor of infidelity, but in the guise of a professed faith, and trifle with the stupendous and priceless truths of a revelation whose chief value is derived from the very elements so ruthlessly expunged. Such is the crime of the higher criticism." *

Now something about the Silence of History:

Sceptics have grounded doubts concerning the facts of Christianity on the silence of profane historians of the time of the writers of the Bible. Tacitus, Juvenal and Pliny prove that the doubts have no basis of fact. So do the catacombs of the first century. The younger Pliny talks about Vesuvius, its eruptions, but makes no mention of Herculaneum and Pompeii. Humboldt was one of these doubters. See how he contradicts and destroys his theory in the following, from Varnhagen's diary: "Humboldt confirms the opinion I have more than once expressed, that too much must not be inferred from the silence of authors. He adduces three important and undeniable facts, as to which one finds no evidence in places where one would naturally above all others expect to find it. In the records of Barcelona there is not a trace of the triumphal entry made by Columbus; in Marco Polo no mention of the great wall of China; and in the archives of Portugal nothing about the voyage of Amerigo Vespucci in the service of that crown. (History of the Geography of the New World, Part IV., p. 160.) Still more is this the case when the historian is a polite man of the world, as were all the Roman historians of the first century, and when the religion is one of lowliness. Of this we have illustrations in our own time. Thus Smollett never noticed the Methodist movement of 1750; nor has Lord Mahon, a historian peculiarly sober and comprehensive, noticed the contemporaneous evangelical revival of the Church of England. Yet what other events have had greater permanent results, and at the same time rest upon a more undisputed basis of facts? This line of argument eliminates the force of the evidence cited by the defendant from the "Bible, Church and Reason," pages 136-139.†

* *Methodist Review*, November, 1890.

† *Family Treasury* (Second Half-Year, 1860), page 201.

CHARGE VI.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a Minister of the said Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that Sanctification is not complete at death, which is contrary to the essential doctrine of Holy Scripture and of the Standards of the said Church, that the souls of believers are at their death at once made perfect in holiness.

I will not spend time in reading the specification and proofs.

All that we can know on this subject is derived entirely from revelation. The Scriptures call it a mystery. I claim that in what they say about it there is nothing to warrant more than the name of Middle State, if even that, in describing the interval between death and the resurrection; nothing to warrant the extension of the process rather than the fact of the enjoyment of redemption after death; nothing to warrant the theory of progressive sanctification after death.

Now, there are some things very clear in the revelation of this mystery in I. Cor. 15 (51, 52). All dead Christians are asleep. When we are asleep we show the rest which consists in the inaction of mind and body. But all Christians, both dead and living, must be changed; and why the dead Christians should be compelled to go through the process of sanctification in the Middle State, while the living Christians are the subjects of immediate sanctification, I cannot imagine. The Court will notice that the dead are raised incorruptible. The context shows that they become incorruptible, as this corruptible puts on incorruption and as this mortal puts on immortality.

In Hebrews xii. : 23, the thought of the writer is absorbed by the society of that heaven to which he and his fellow pilgrims were going as he speaks of the spirits of just men made perfect. And Lange on Hebrews, page 208, observes that "the mention of 'the spirits of the just made perfect' argues decisively alike against the assumption of a sleep of the souls of the departed, and against the doctrine of a purgatory," and we might add that it argues against the unpsychological, the unethical, the contra-confessional and unscriptural doctrines of the Middle State set

forth in the Inaugural Address, and which is the ground of Charge VI.

But let Scripture interpret Scripture. In John i. 29:

“29 The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.”

John the Baptist certainly affirms that the atonement of Christ removes the sin with its penalty which bars us out of heaven, as is evident from the fact that the writer of the Fourth Gospel, the Apostle John, when he gives us Revelation's record of what he saw in heaven, declares, Rev. vii. 9, 13, 14:

“9 After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands. 13 And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence come they? 14 And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb”; teaching that the multitude of the world's redeemed gathered around this same Lamb, and that their robes were washed and made white in His blood. Rev. 14: 13 says: “And I heard a voice from Heaven saying unto me, Write blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them,” that those who die in the Lord rest from their labours; and that the members of the Church, the Lamb's wife, Rev. 19: 8: “And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints,” teaching that saved sinners are arrayed in that fine linen, clean and white, which is the righteousness of saints. And 1 John 3: 2: “Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is,”

teaches that it is not safe to dogmatize on the details of our future because it doth not yet appear what we shall be. We only

know one thing; we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is; and does not the presence of Christ require complete sanctification? I call attention to the following Scripture.

1 John 3: 9-10: “9 Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. 10 In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil; whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.”

Timothy 4: 7-8: “7 But refuse profane and old wives’ fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness. 8 For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come;”

and Revelations 3: 4-5: “4 Thou hast a few names even in Sardis which have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white; for they are worthy. 5 He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels.”

These passages present the doctrine of sanctification. The sanctified do not commit sin, do righteousness, love the brethren, exercise themselves unto godliness, do not defile their garments, thus exhibiting that godliness which has the promise of the life to come. These undefiled on earth pass through death to heaven and are clothed in white raiment, enrolled in heaven’s registry, and confessed by Christ before the Father and the holy angels.*

“25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; 26 That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, 27 That he might present it to himself a glorious church not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.”

This passage describes earth’s work as the Church is sanctified and cleaned with the washing of water by the word as Christians are living Bibles. But the same Church in Heaven is a glorious Church without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, holy and without

* Ephesians 5: 25-27

blemish. In Ephesians, 3: 15-16: "15 Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named. 16 That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man." Paul does not pray for that part of the Church which is in heaven, but for that part on the earth, when he says, "That He would grant you according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man."

Luke 16: 22, 26:

"22 And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom; the rich man also died, and was buried. 26 And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence",

proves that as death finds us, eternity fixes us.

The standards are the expression of these declarations of Scripture. Christ takes care of the departed soul and the dead body until the reunion at the resurrection of the last day.

Therefore, psychology has no statement, ethical philosophy has no construction, the logic of sanctification no refinement that ought to lead this Court to give the least consideration to the Inaugural's theory of progressive sanctification after death. The Inaugural certainly deals with the future state in a manner unwarranted by the example of those who have returned to the earth from behind the veil which separates time from eternity. Samuel appeared to Saul, the doomed king, and, if I mistake not, he made the monarch feel that there would be no reversal of his sentence. Lazarus came forth from the tomb to show how Jesus Christ makes death stingless, and is it to make death stingless to usher us into the dying incident to sanctification in this life. Paul was caught up into the third heaven, and this Inaugural presumes to speak *ex cathedra* concerning a state where he says that he "heard unspeakable words not lawful for a man to utter."* Jesus Christ left the sepulchre, and the New Testament, from the Acts of the Apostles to the book of Revelation, inclusive, does not show a scintilla of proof that in His instruc-

* II, Corinthians xii. 4.

tion of the disciples in the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, during the forty days' interval between His resurrection and ascension, He gave the faintest hint of progressive sanctification after death. Although Samuel, Lazarus and Paul are silent and Jesus Christ confirms them in that silence, yet the Inaugural, in spite of that silence, steps forth with a logic whose conclusion is that it is not exactly unsafe for a man to die impenitent, for if the righteous can fill up the lack of this life in the future, the wicked ought to have the same chance; the conclusion that the righteous are not after death in a state where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest, a conclusion which encourages prayer for the dead and cuts the nerve of evangelistic effort.

The Inaugural does not make a legitimate use of Reason in its eschatology. It deplores the neglect to study "the Messiah's descent into the abode of the dead (I quote): a doctrine of great importance to the Ancient Church of His resurrection, His enthronement, His reign of grace, His second advent—O how these have been neglected."* So say I, so says the Bible, so says the Confession, but both Bible and Confession warn us to confine our studies on these subjects to the lines laid down by the Scriptures. We are never to forget the lesson our Lord taught Peter: "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shall know hereafter."† We are not to be oblivious to the fact that, along with Paul, we see through a glass darkly; only know in part; must pass into the beyond before we can see face to face, and know even as we are known. We are to remember that, while on earth speaking as a child, understanding as a child, thinking as a child, we can neither speak, nor understand, nor think as we will when having attained that perfect holiness which is the believer's at death we have put away childish things. So that the danger of dogmatizing concerning the future lies in the look of the student through the darkness; in his exhibition of the vain reach of partial knowledge after certainty; in the display of the undeveloped powers of human nature's childishness, as they manifest themselves in hypothetical statements and remote possibilities. It

* Inaugural Address, Third Edition, page 61.

† John 13:7.

goes without saying, in the literary, scientific and theological worlds, that this is the common fault of that Higher Criticism which the Inaugural represents. An expert in its line of investigation tells us that, since 1850, the Higher Critics have set forth 539 theories in regard to the Old Testament, and 208 in regard to the New Testament. Of the whole 747, 603 have been given up, and a goodly portion of the remaining 144 are losing their hold. How true the remark of the author of the Inaugural Address, in his Biblical Study, page 80: "Criticism itself, as a human method of knowledge, is also defective, and needs self-criticism for its own rectification, security and progress. It must again and again verify its methods and correct its processes." I have somewhere noticed the suggestion that some optical students have been of opinion that, if they had been consulted, the eye might have been better made than nature or the Creator has made it. But such criticism requires Omniscience to justify it. I think that I put it rightly when I say that, in ourselves, as we grapple with the problems of the Bible, and especially with the problem of the Middle State, we

" Are infants crying in the night,
And with no language but a cry,"

and we announce no new discovery when we say that the Higher Criticism has disciples who forget, in their study of the Bible, that an infant is dealing with the Omniscient God.

Thus, Mr. Moderator, Fathers and Brethren of this venerable Court, I have endeavored to show why the Court should sustain the Charges and Specifications tabled by the Committee of Prosecution.

The Committee has confined itself to that which is fundamental to the whole discussion. It has sought to grasp the root of the matter, on account of the principle laid down by our Lord in Luke 6:43-44: "For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. For every tree is known by his own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs; neither of a bramble-bush gather they grapes."

The Prosecuting Committee do not plead at the bar of this Court as the opponents of Higher Criticism. We all believe that the Scriptures should be searched by the most thorough scholar-

ship. But we do not disguise the fact that we are but five of the thousands who are the foes of that Higher Criticism which has borne fruit in such a production as the Inaugural Address. For its denial of an infallible Bible brings forth fruit in an exceedingly fallible system of theology. It makes light of the Supernatural element of the Scripture miracle, notwithstanding the proof it gave to Nicodemus of the direct agency of God, notwithstanding the denial by Peter that there was anything occult in the cure of the lame man who laid at the gate of the temple. Its presentation of man's original condition speaks the language neither of the Scriptures nor of the Standards with respect to original righteousness and original sin. Its assertion of race-redemption at once suggests Universalism, and seems to set aside individual regeneration, faith, repentance and accountability. While it exalts the ancient heroes of the faith, it takes care to tell us that respectable modern society would not receive into the family Noah and Abraham, Jacob and Judah, David and Solomon. It bases this surprising statement on the opinion that in their time, the divine exposition of sin was not so searching, and the divine law of righteousness not so evident. But Hebrews, XI., teaches the contrary with respect to Noah, Abraham and Jacob. Judah could teach many modern sinners a lesson of honesty. I. Kings, iv. 5 informs us that David, with one exception, turned not aside from that which was right in the sight of the Lord. Solomon was in close communion with God. We are not to forget that all these persons were under the correction of divine righteousness.

The Inaugural Address refers to the ethics of Jesus Christ in terms which do not recall Paul's idea of ethical Christianity, as he says: "I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me." It is out of harmony with all the prayer and singing and preaching of evangelical churches. It confounds fact with traditionalism and falsifies History, Philosophy and Science as applicable to the Scriptures, by exalting what is called Biblical Theology to the disparagement of Systematic Theology as formulated in the Creeds and Confessions of the Church, while everybody knows that Systematic Theology, to be theology, must be Biblical Theology, and that the Bible

itself abounds in systematic statement; as for example the Ten Commandments and the Apostolic Benediction. But the unscientific character of this Biblical Theology is apparent in the fact that it so abounds in statements which involve the nature of the Bible itself as to give ground for the following inquiries from an infidel of the present day: "Is it (the Bible) the Word of God, or does it only contain some words of God? Was it verbally inspired or inspired only in a general way? Did the events which it records actually happen, or are many of its stories which appear in historical form only symbolical myths or fairy tales? Was the world created in six days, or is the first part of Genesis only a poem?"

We cannot deny the existence of a widely spread conviction that the Inaugural Address has a divisive and destructive tendency which imperils the peace of the Church, encourages the enemies of the truth, and interferes with the proper training of our candidates for the ministry. And all this it does in the nomenclature of the Higher Criticism. We extract from its vocabulary, as follows: Imagination; Inference; Conjecture; Psychological Sense; Development; Philosophy; Method of Inference; I venture to affirm; Suggests the conjecture; I assume; I exclude; Evidently inserted; Interpolation; Best scholarship; Blind conservatism; Narrow traditionalism.

Just here is the place for a very brief outline of the evolution of the document which is the immediate occasion of the Charges and Specifications before the Court.

I. Jean Astruc, 1684-1753: "Conjectures on the original memoirs which Moses used in completing the Book of Genesis." It appears that Astruc did not tell the truth concerning his first publication. Voltaire called Astruc's work audacious, dangerous, and said that "it redoubled the darkness it sought to disperse."

II. Johann Salome Semler, 1725-1791, Professor at Halle, Prof. Kurtz declares that he cast doubt on the genuineness of the biblical writings by setting up a theory of inspiration and accommodation which admitted the presence of error, misunderstanding and pious fraud in the Scriptures, by a style of exposition which put aside everything unattractive in the New Testament as "rem-

nants of Judaism " by a critical treatment of the Church and its doctrines, which represented the doctrines of the Church as the result of blundering, misconception and violence," &c.

III. George Lorenz Bauer, 1755-1806, Professor at Heidelberg. Bible to be interpreted by grammatical and historical considerations; not with reference to theological doctrines. Difference between the dogmatic opinions of the writers of the different books of the Bible, Biblical Theology of the Inaugural Address found in this writer.

IV. Bruno Bauer, 1809. Free action of the reason. Many catch words, terms of the author of the Inaugural are from this author, *e. g.*, The Inaugural uses the term *The Reason*. In English we usually say "Reason" without "The."

This notable Address deals with the established verities of Christianity, as for example the Divine Sovereignty and the Atonement, as the student of mathematics whose problems propose conditions which contradict the axioms of the science, such as "The whole is the sum of all its parts." "Things that are equal to the same thing are equal to one another." For there is no Divine Sovereignty if God recalled a decree in the case of Nineveh; there is no Atonement, if men are saved irrespective of individual character. Science reports facts; history events; theology doctrines; but the author of the Inaugural reports theories which are the fruit of his individual conclusions, not established results.

This Court should not lose sight of the fact that the defendant is a theological teacher. Let me invite its attention to the following observations on the relation of students to a popular professor, which were occasioned by an ecclesiastical trial on the other side of the ocean. "The students look not in the dry light of exegesis. If they do not support a popular professor whether right or wrong, it is evident that their personal attachment strongly influences them. And the fact that students are prone to give unreasoning regard to a popular professor, might be cited as a good reason why the Church should carefully select its theological professors." The force of this statement is effectively described by Mr. Spurgeon, "I heard of a gentleman who taught Greek. After a while the class went to another gentle-

man, and he said that it was more trouble to get the wrong teaching they had received out of their heads than to get the right teaching in. To unlearn is more trouble than to learn."

If I mistake not the Presbyterian Church will be slow to commend instruction which sends forth ministers from her theological halls *trained to doubt rather than to believe*.

So, considered as a whole, the Inaugural Address in its hermeneutics, is unscientific; in its theology, unbiblical; in its anthropology, unphilosophical; in its soteriology, inadequate; in its eschatology, a guess; in its ecclesiology, Romish; in its polemics, heterodox; in its practical theology, contradicting the axiom "That truth is in order to goodness." And this is just because of the principle announced by its author in Biblical Study, page 194: "That the exegete prefers the *may* until he is forced to the *must*," a principle which has certainly run to seed in the Inaugural.

If this Court sustains the Charges and Specifications tabled by the Committee of Prosecution it will be because it deems that the Inaugural Address puts the author out of relation with his denominational environment. This belief is emphasized when we consider his professional environment. The Inaugural is not abreast of Dr. Henry B. Smith on Inspiration and Eschatology. It is not abreast of Dr. Schaff on "Biblical Interpretation" in Lange's Commentary, and on the Westminster Confession in his "Creeds of Christendom." It is not abreast of Dr. Vincent in his "Word Studies of the New Testament." It runs right athwart the Hebrew and Greek Lexicons of the man who gives the name to the Edward Robinson Chair of Biblical Theology in the Union Seminary. And when it makes so little of what it calls the circumstantials of Scripture it discounts the faithful labors whose glorious result appeared in the publication of "Biblical Researches in Palestine" in the interest of a verification of the circumstantials of the Bible. It is also out of relation with the consensus of thought of the American Presbyterian ministry, both past and present (among whom are not a few of the Union Seminary Alumni), and has brought forth a protest from the rank and file of the denomination.

Surprise has been expressed that we ordinary pastors and lay-

men should presume to call in question the deductions of eminent scholarship. Spener once, in talking about Martin Luther, said: "When a dwarf stands upon the shoulders of a giant, he owes his commanding view to the tallness of his upholder." No wonder, then, that a common instructor, who is far inferior to Luther, should sometimes see things the Great Reformer himself did not see, and which he could not have discovered if he had not been lifted so high by Luther. Now, Mr. Moderator, I have endeavored to look at this question from the shoulders of two millenniums of scholarship, and I think myself happy in announcing that in this argument I have found no firmer support than when I have stood on the shoulders of professors of the Union Theological Seminary.

Mr. Moderator, Fathers and Brethren: The members of the Committee of Prosecution, in pleading before this venerable Court, are no less anxious that these Charges and Specifications should fail if we are wrong than we are that they should be sustained if we are right.

But until convinced that we are wrong we feel that it would be wrong for the Presbyterian Church to compromise in the slightest degree her position with respect to the authority of the Holy Scripture and with respect to the Bible, which commences with Genesis and ends with Revelation, translated into English out of the Original Tongues, both in its circumstantial and essentials, whether they appear in "narrative example, description type, argument, appeal, exhortation, warning, precept, promise, presentations and representations, in prose and poetry,"* and confirmed by the philology, archæology, chronology, historiology, ecclesiology, theology and psychology of human scholarship, as the sceptre of that authority.

It will indeed be a sad day for the Presbyterian Church when, breathing the atmosphere of the Inaugural Address, she so forgets herself as to declare that a man's moral sense is the test of inspiration; as to turn her back on ethics and theology for the sake of Hebrew roots; as to magnify learning at the expense of logic; as to assert that criticism is everything and character nothing; as to deny common sense for the sake of uncommon

* McCosh's *Intuitions of the Mind*, page 444.

scholastic attainments; as to banish the Divine factor from history; as to sacrifice truth to antithesis.

Two children were playing with a boat at the seaside. "You will have to fix that mast better before you sail it," said their father. "But," said the boy, only too eager to launch the miniature vessel, "it's all but right." "All but right," said his discerning elder sister, "all but right; well, *that's* wrong." Now, if a minister or teacher be all but right with respect to the Holy Scripture as God's word written, and the rule of faith and practice, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America would be false to her standards, false to her history, false to the world, and false to her God, if she were not to say, "Well, *that's* wrong." For she cannot do without the cloud by day and pillar of fire by night, which God has given her in this blessed old Book, God's Book, Reason's Book, the Church's Book, and consequently Man's Book. Rock firmer than Gibraltar, for heaven and earth shall pass away, but the Word which Christ the Word of the Word owns as His, shall not pass away; Rock of the Ages, with its one old, old story, which American Presbyterianism has told, and will tell over and over and over again; the story that pierced the gloom of Eden's expulsion with the light of hope as it beamed from the Star of Bethlehem; the story that cheered Abraham's heart as he looked forward to Christ's day and was glad; the story that caused David to leave the world with an anthem of triumph as he sung of an everlasting covenant ordered in all things and sure; the story which made the visit of Nicodemus to Jesus the most memorable night of His life; the story with which the Holy Ghost shook Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost; the story through which my brother in Christ we received power to become the sons of God as we believed on His name; the story which the Church Militant will through her courts, her theological seminaries, her pulpits, her Sunday schools, her homes, her members ever tell as she goes up through this wilderness to the Church Triumphant singing Dear dying Lamb, Thou Christ of the Bible; Thou Christ of the Old Testament; Thou Christ of the Law; Thou Christ of the Prophets, and Thou Christ of the Psalms; Thou Christ of the New Testament; Thou Christ of the

Gospels; Thou Christ of the Acts of the Apostles, the Gospel of the Holy Ghost; Thou Christ of the Epistles; Thou Christ of the Book of Revelation; Thou Christ of the Divine, Infallible, Inerrant Bible.

“ Dear dying Lamb, thy precious blood
Shall never lose its power
Till all the ransomed church of God
Be saved to sin no more.”

